



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2010

No. 2

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 19, 2010, at 11 a.m.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2010

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MORAN of Virginia).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 12, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES P. MORAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

As the 111th Congress reassembles to meet its constitutional commitments in its second session, may the prophetic cry of Israel, from the prophet, be heard in the hearts of all Members and in the attitude of all America's people:

As the Lord has called you
for the victory of justice,
I have grasped you by the hand.
I formed you and set you
as a covenant of the people;
a light for all the nations.
Accomplish great deeds in and
through us, Lord, and make these days
a time of great promise and fulfilled
blessings. Amen.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will utilize the electronic system to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean

Becerra
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccheri
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell

Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Cao

Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Childers
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison

Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden

Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

Lungren, Daniel E.	Pastor (AZ)	Sherman
Lynch	Paul	Shimkus
Maffei	Paulsen	Shuster
Maloney	Payne	Sires
Manzullo	Pelosi	Skelton
Markey (CO)	Pence	Slaughter
Markey (MA)	Perlmutter	Smith (NE)
Marshall	Perriello	Smith (NJ)
Massa	Peters	Smith (TX)
Matheson	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Matsui	Petri	Snyder
McCarthy (NY)	Pingree (ME)	Space
McCaul	Pitts	Speier
McClintock	Polis (CO)	Spratt
McCollum	Pomeroy	Stark
McCotter	Possey	Stearns
McDermott	Price (GA)	Stupak
McGovern	Price (NC)	Sullivan
McHenry	Putnam	Sutton
McIntyre	Quigley	Tanner
McKeon	Rangel	Taylor
McMahon	Rehberg	Teague
McMorris	Reichert	Terry
Rodgers	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
McNerney	Richardson	Thompson (MS)
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Thompson (PA)
Melancon	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Tiahrt
Michaud	Rogers (MI)	Tierney
Miller (FL)	Rooney	Titus
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Tonko
Miller (NC)	Ross	Towns
Miller, Gary	Rothman (NJ)	Tsongas
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Turner
Minnick	Royce	Upton
Mitchell	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Moore (KS)	Rush	Velázquez
Moran (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Walden
Moran (VA)	Salazar	Walz
Murphy (NY)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Wasserman
Murphy, Patrick	Sanchez, Loretta	Schultz
Murphy, Tim	Sarbanes	Watson
Murtha	Scalise	Watt
Myrick	Schakowsky	Waxman
Nadler (NY)	Schauer	Weiner
Napolitano	Schiff	Welch
Neal (MA)	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Neugebauer	Schrader	Whitfield
Nunes	Schwartz	Wilson (OH)
Nye	Scott (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Wittman
Obey	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Olson	Serrano	Woolsey
Olver	Sessions	Wu
Owens	Sestak	Yarmuth
Pallone	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Pascarella	Shea-Porter	Young (FL)

□ 1907

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS). On this roll call, 373 Members have recorded their presence.

A quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the proceedings of January 5, 2010, and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PROVIDING FOR A COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 998

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States when a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 998, and the order of the House of January 6, 2010, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members to the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States when a quorum of each House has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make:

the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and
the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

TO INFORM THE SENATE THAT A QUORUM OF THE HOUSE HAS ASSEMBLED

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 999

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE HOUR OF MEETING OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1000

Resolved, That unless otherwise ordered, before Monday, May 17, 2010, the hour of daily meeting of the House shall be 2 p.m. on Mondays; noon on Tuesdays; and 10 a.m. on Wednesdays and Thursdays; and 9 a.m. on all other days of the week; and from Monday, May 17, 2010, for the remainder of the 111th Congress, the hour of daily meeting of the

House shall be noon on Mondays, 10 a.m. on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays; and 9 a.m. on all other days of the week.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 6, 2009, providing for morning-hour debate be extended for the remainder of the 111th Congress, except that House Resolution 1000 shall supplant House Resolution 10 and the date of May 17, 2010, shall be used in lieu of May 18, 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 64

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if a veto message on House Joint Resolution 64 is laid before the House on this legislative day, then after the message is read and the objections of the President are spread at large upon the Journal, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution shall be postponed until the legislative day of Wednesday, January 13, 2010; and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 30, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a message received from the White House on Wednesday, December 30, 2009 at 1:20 p.m., containing the returned enrollment of H.J. Res. 64 and a memorandum of disapproval from the President.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2010—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-84)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

The enactment of H.R. 3326 (Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2010, Public Law 111-118), which was signed into law on December 19, 2009, has rendered the enactment of H.J. Res. 64 (Continuing Appropriations, FY 2010) unnecessary. Accordingly, I am withholding my approval from the bill. (The Pocket Veto Case, 279 U.S. 655 (1929)).

To leave no doubt that the bill is being vetoed as unnecessary legislation, in addition to withholding my signature, I am also returning H.J. Res. 64 to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, along with this Memorandum of Disapproval.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 30, 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the joint resolution will be printed as a House document.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution are postponed until the legislative day of Wednesday, January 13, 2010, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

□ 1915

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 29, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Thursday, December 24, 2009 at 1:41 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a proclamation he has issued entitled, "TO MODIFY DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES."

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

TO MODIFY DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-85)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) offers duty-free treatment to specified products that are imported from designated beneficiary developing countries. The GSP is authorized by title V of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act").

In accordance with sections 502(f)(1)(A) and 502(f)(2) of the Act, I am providing notification of my intent to add the Republic of Maldives to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the GSP program and my intent to terminate the designations of Croatia and Equatorial Guinea as beneficiary developing countries under the GSP program.

In Proclamation 6813 of July 28, 1995, the designation of Maldives as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP program was suspended. After considering the criteria set forth in sections 501 and 502 of the Act, I have determined that the suspension of the designation of Maldives as a GSP beneficiary developing country should be ended.

In addition, I have determined that Croatia and Equatorial Guinea have each become a "high income" country, as defined by the official statistics of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. In accordance with section 502(e) of the Act, I have determined that the designations of Croatia and Equatorial Guinea as beneficiary developing countries under the GSP program should be terminated, effective January 1, 2011.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 23, 2009.

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT DAVE McCONNELL

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to salute a Washington correspondent, Dave McConnell, who is a good friend of mine and who this month is marking his 45th anniversary with WTOP radio.

Since 1965, Dave has been a Washington radio institution; and since 1981, he has been reporting full time from Capitol Hill. I dare say that every one of us in this Chamber has had an opportunity to talk to our friend, David McConnell. He has reported with the

insight and impartiality that typified journalism at its best.

In that time, Dave's career has been repeatedly recognized by his colleagues. His honors include, among others, the A.I.R. Lifetime Achievement Award, Maryland and Virginia AP Broadcast Journalism Reporting Awards, and induction in the Society of Professional Journalists Hall of Fame. Decades of listeners have turned to Dave for inside knowledge on how their Congress works.

Along with many other Members of Congress, I am glad to call Dave a friend. We share our home State of Maryland and an abiding love of the institution of the House of Representatives. And I trust that that love will inspire Dave's works here for many years to come. As he has often said, and I quote, "As long as I have a seat covering the greatest show on Earth and can witness history being made, I'm going to keep reporting."

Dave, we hope you do. You do it well. God bless you and congratulations.

CBS' "60 MINUTES" WINS LAP DOG AWARD

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, CBS' "60 Minutes" is the winner of the Media Fairness Caucus' highly un-coveted "Lap Dog Award" for this week's most glaring example of media bias.

A new book called "Game Change" has brought to light comments made by the Senate majority leader that some people find offensive. On Sunday, "60 Minutes" featured a 13-minute story about the book and interviewed its authors. Not once did "60 Minutes" mention the majority leader's comments. Instead, they devoted 10 minutes to negative comments about former Governor Sarah Palin.

What an astounding example of biased journalism. It is no wonder five out of six Americans see the national news media as "very or somewhat biased," according to a recent public opinion poll.

CBS and "60 Minutes" should report the facts, not engage in double standards.

HONORING TONY CARNEMOLLA

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Tony Carnemolla, who recently passed away at age 74.

Tony made a difference in the lives of countless residents of our community. His active involvement as commander of VFW Post 75 in Danville and civic organizations like the Exchange Club serves as a lasting example for the residents of Danville and the San Ramon Valley.

At age 17, Tony Carnemolla joined the Army to serve our great Nation during the Korean War. Later, he became a tireless volunteer and advocate for his fellow veterans. He spearheaded the effort to renovate the Veterans Memorial Building in Danville and volunteered at countless local events to benefit veterans.

Tony was a warm and respected leader and a dear friend. He will be missed. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Tony Carnemolla and in sending our thoughts and prayers to his beloved family and friends.

HONORING ARMY SPECIALIST JASON JOHNSTON

(Mr. LEE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEE of New York. On December 26, our Nation lost a true hero.

Army Specialist Jason Johnston of Albion, New York, was killed in action in southern Afghanistan while serving on his second tour of duty. He volunteered to return, feeling a strong commitment to his fellow soldiers and insisting on joining them for a second deployment.

Specialist Johnston was an elite soldier, the top 1 percent, according to a major general with the U.S. Army at Fort Bragg, where Jason was stationed. His bravery was without question and his valor beyond measure.

It is because of the sacrifices that our Nation's brave soldiers like Specialist Johnston make each and every day in regions far across the globe that keep Americans sleeping safely at night.

Specialist Johnston was one of the Nation's finest soldiers. As his family said last week, he "was a hometown hero who died serving the country he loved." He will be missed.

HONORING WILLIE MITCHELL

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. This past week, the city of Memphis and the world lost a great musical producer and musical icon, Willie Mitchell.

Willie Mitchell was laid to rest today in Memphis, Tennessee. He produced a sound that included O.V. Wright, Syl Johnson, and Ann Peebles; but his most famous find was Al Green.

A great horn player and a great musician, Willie Mitchell was in Texas and Al Green was on the bill. He told Al Green, Come back to Memphis, and I will make you a star, and he did that. It happened so much in Memphis: Come to Memphis, and I will make you a star, and it happened.

Willie Mitchell was part of that great Memphis legend and soul music. He was loved by people in the studio and by his family. He received the Trustees Award from the Grammys in 2008 for a

lifetime of achievement. He gave people lots of love and happiness and reasons to stay together, he and Al Green.

He leaves two wonderful daughters, two grandsons who became his sons, a stepson, a musical history and a musical tradition that will live on forever. We will all miss Willie Mitchell and appreciate the fact that he came our way and helped produce the Memphis sound.

JOBS IN THE NEW YEAR

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Bureau of Labor and Statistics released its final economic report for 2009. Unfortunately, the report showed the year ending on a very disappointing note: 85,000 more jobs lost and 10 percent unemployment for the month of December.

It is very clear that the excessive borrowing and spending in Washington is not paying off where it is needed most: job creation. In fact, just this week, an investigation by the Associated Press found that large portions of the \$787 billion stimulus plan had "no effect on local employment."

Mr. Speaker, Americans across the country have already made their 2010 New Year's resolutions. Congress now needs to make its own, and that is that job creation will be our number one priority.

An economic recovery without jobs is not a recovery. I urge Congress, as we get back to work this month, to finally work together to enact real bipartisan solutions that will give the American people what they want: more jobs, without breaking the bank.

H.R. 4414

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. I have introduced H.R. 4414, the Responsible Bankers Act of 2010. Now, many of you know I voted against both pieces of TARP legislation.

It is time that America got their money back and imposed a 75 percent tax on the bonuses that bankers are planning to pay themselves using wind-fall profits earned from massive taxpayer support of the financial services industry. The Responsible Bankers Act will not penalize banks for making a profit but, rather, will tax the bonus pools that are set aside.

As I pointed out a month ago, bankers are preparing to pay themselves record bonuses, rather than lending and investing in American prosperity. They should use their profits, and they could use their profits, to do many things to improve the prospects of the American economy, like strengthen their capital base, reduce fees charged to customers, or increase lending to

small and medium-sized companies. Well, they are not doing that. They are hoarding it. They are using the money to try to take over other banks.

H.R. 4414 draws on the movement that is happening right now in the U.K. and around the world, where people are waking up that if banks are not there to help with the economy of the Nation, then they should have to pay a serious tax on their bonuses.

OUR FOUNDING FATHERS, THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE REVOLUTION

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, James Madison said in Federalist 45: "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain with the State governments are numerous and indefinite."

Later codified in the 10th Amendment, the Founding Fathers intended the powers of the States to act as a check on those of the Federal Government, and the Supreme Court said, in 1975, that "Congress may not exercise power in a fashion that impairs the States' integrity or ability to function effectively."

Mr. Speaker, time and time again, this Congress over the past year has forgotten the purpose of the 10th Amendment, from hate crimes to health care. We either stand with the Founding Fathers, the Constitution, and the Revolution, or we don't. And, if we do not, we do so at our peril.

AMERICA MUST ANSWER THE CALL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Happy New Year to America. As we start this new year, I believe it is important to clarify a lot of misinterpretations about what the job of the Federal Government is and what this Congress' responsibility is.

We are problem-solvers. We work to solve the issues on behalf of the American people. And as we look at this health care debate, which I hope will be entirely transparent, let the underlying premise be that 36 million people are without insurance.

In addition, this health care bill will generate numerous numbers of jobs and new health professional scholarships to provide for doctors and nurses, making sure that you do not have a denial of insurance because of preexisting disease.

And jobs we must make. We must move forward on the jobs bill, and I am in particular pushing one that says if you are on unemployment insurance, you can continue to get training. Scholarships and a stipend will be given to you along with your unemployment insurance so you can train for the new jobs.

We have to be innovative and know what the American people want; but, most of all, the government of the United States is a problem-solver. The people of America are hurting, and we must address the questions of health care and the underutilized ability for Americans to be served by new health care as well as new jobs. America must answer the call.

SCHWARZENEGGER'S FOLLY

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, California's Governor is seeking billions of dollars of additional Federal funds in order to fill his ever-widening budget deficits.

Last April, he imposed the biggest tax increase by any State in American history, despite repeated warnings of the damage it would do to the State's economy. California already had the highest sales and income taxes in the Nation. He increased both.

The taxes were supposed to produce \$13 billion of additional revenue. But after 9 months, California's sales tax collections are down \$270 million; income tax collections are down \$10 billion. The only major tax not raised, the corporate tax, is the only tax that is producing more revenue. That is up \$2.4 billion in the same period.

I have a modest suggestion to Governor Schwarzenegger: rescind the tax increase that has crushed California's economy and its revenues. And to my House colleagues, let's not repeat Governor Schwarzenegger's folly nationally.

□ 1930

TAX CREDITS FOR GOLF CARTS

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. My Democrat colleagues, Mr. Speaker, are going to solve the health care problems of this country with a 2,100-plus page bill, and it's going to simplify the whole procedure and make everything better. But let me just give you an example of how things go awry.

We passed an amendment in this body that deals with the Internal Revenue Code so people would buy more green cars that weren't going to pollute the atmosphere, and bioelectric cars. Well, John Stossel of Fox network saw where there were free golf carts and called up, and he found out that he could get a golf cart for \$6,490, but because Congress screwed up with the tax code, he could get all of that money back from the taxpayers of this country, in essence, getting that golf cart for free.

That's how government continues to screw up. And if you think that's bad, just think what's going to happen if we

pass this terrible health care bill that's going to raise taxes and ration health care and hurt seniors because it's going to cause them to lose a lot of their Medicare and Medicare Advantage coverage.

That's why we shouldn't be rushing to judgment on the health care bill. This is the kind of screw-up that should not take place.

CONGRATULATING THE PENN STATE UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL TEAM

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in awe of the Penn State University women's volleyball team. We often hear in this Chamber from Members who celebrate a national championship or an undefeated team from around the country, but rarely have I heard a record equal to that of these particular Nittany Lions. I would just cite a few of their accomplishments and allow you to judge for yourself.

This team hasn't lost a game since 2007. They had a 101-game winning streak, an undefeated season, a record 18 consecutive NCAA tournament victories, and on December 19, they beat the University of Texas Lady Longhorns for their third consecutive national championship.

Coach Russ Rose deserves a great deal of credit for the success of these young college athletes, and I can't say enough about the team and its leaders. Megan Hodge became just the fifth player in Division I history to be named first-team All-American 4 years in a row and also was named the American Volleyball Coaches Association's National Player of the Year for 2009.

It isn't enough to say I'm proud of this team. I repeat that I'm awestruck and struggle to find the words to properly praise them. So I will simply say, Congratulations.

PROGRESS IN WAR ON TERROR

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, I was pleased to see The New York Times acknowledge Afghanistan and Iraq as the central front in America's struggle against Islamic extremism. It further cites how the United States is making progress turning security efforts over to the Iraqi military and police forces.

The Washington Post covered the year-end review by General David Petraeus and General Ray Odierno and highlighted how over the last 2 years there's been a 92 percent decrease in security incidents and a 90 percent decrease in civilian deaths due to the surge. Attacks have dropped from more

than 200 a day in 2 years to approximately 15 today.

I want to thank General Petraeus and General Odierno, our troops, military families, and veterans for their commitment to victory in Iraq and Afghanistan to protect American families at home by defeating terrorists overseas.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Welcome, Anna Grace Wilson, born December 17, 2009, daughter of Jennifer and Alan Wilson, at Lexington Medical Center, West Columbia, South Carolina.

TRANSPARENCY IN GOVERNMENT

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. We heard the President—now the President—say back in a debate with Hillary Clinton in 2008, "That's what I will do in bringing all the parties together, not negotiating behind closed doors, but bringing all parties together, and broadcasting those negotiations on C-SPAN so that the American people can see what the choices are."

We know in the debate, when he was running against JOHN MCCAIN, our now-President said, "I'm going to have all the negotiations around a big table. We'll have doctors and nurses and hospital administrators. Insurance companies, drug companies—they'll get a seat at the table, they just won't be able to buy every chair. But what we will do is, we'll have the negotiations televised on C-SPAN so that people can see who's making arguments on behalf of their constituents and who's making arguments on behalf of the drug companies or the insurance companies."

We heard the Speaker say repeatedly that when she was Speaker, this would be the most open government ever. So it's deeply perplexing, since we know they would never lie, why they're preventing what they promised from coming true.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE MICHAEL M. HONDA, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable MICHAEL M. HONDA, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 8, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued in the Superior Court for Santa Clara County, California, for documents in a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL M. HONDA,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

VISA LOTTERY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, in the news since Christmas Day has been great concern about the security of our country related to individuals entering this country and attempting to perpetrate harm on our citizens. It harkens back to September 11, 2001, and all the measures that we have taken since then to try to make our Nation a safer place.

One of the areas where we could make it much safer and much fairer for all of our citizens and for those who seek to come to the United States would be to eliminate the visa lottery program. This is a program that awards legal permanent residence status, or "green cards," to foreign nationals based on pure luck.

Literally, the State Department conducts a random lottery. Millions of people submit their names on very short forms, about a half-page long, and then they randomly select out of those millions of people 50,000 winners each year who get to enter the United States through the visa lottery program. They don't have to have any family ties to the United States. They don't have to have any job skills that are in need in the United States. They simply, through pure luck, get to enter this country.

Usually, immigrant visas are issued to foreign nationals that have existing connections with family members lawfully residing in the United States or with U.S. employers. However, under the visa lottery program, visas are awarded to immigrants at random without meeting such criteria.

A perfect example of the system gone awry is the case of Hesham Mohamed Ali Hedayet, the Egyptian national who killed two and wounded three during a shooting spree at Los Angeles International Airport in July 2002. He was allowed to apply for a legal permanent residence status in 1997 because of his wife's status as a visa lottery winner.

In fact, since this program was established in the early 1990s, nearly 1 million people have come into the United States regardless of the need for them to enter this country, regardless of the

unemployment rate, which today stands above 10 percent. And with 15 million Americans looking for work, we give 50,000 visas to people to enter the country not based upon any family ties, not based upon any job skills, simply based upon pure luck.

The State Department's Inspector General testified before Congress recently that it continues to believe that the program "contains significant risks to national security from hostile intelligence officers, criminals, and terrorists attempting to use the program for entry into the United States as permanent residents." With the tool of "legal permanent resident" status in hand, terrorists and spies would have free rein to travel and meet and plan terrorist activities within the borders of the United States.

Even if technical improvements were made to the visa lottery program, nothing would prevent terrorist organizations or foreign intelligence agencies from having members apply for the program who do not have criminal backgrounds, maybe have recently left one of the madrassas in the Middle East and have no record of having been affiliated with a terrorist organization, but that organization could assist them in submitting their names. And if they get a visa if their name is drawn, they don't just get a temporary visa like the 9/11 hijackers or the fellow who just attempted to blow up a Northwest airliner; rather, they get permanent residence status or a green card to live permanently in the United States.

Thirteen of the 14 countries over which the TSA is exercising greater scrutiny in the wake of the attempted Christmas Day bombing plot are eligible to participate in the visa lottery, including Yemen, which has become the focus of much activity on the part of terrorist organizations.

The visa lottery program is wrought with fraud. It is common for foreign nationals to apply for the lottery program multiple times using many different aliases. The State Department's Office of Inspector General declared in its September 2003 report that the visa lottery program is "subject to widespread abuse" and that "identity fraud is endemic, and fraudulent documents are commonplace."

A 2007 Government Accountability Office report found that the visa lottery program is vulnerable to fraudulent activity committed by and against applicants. The same 2007 report found that consular officers at six posts out of 11 reviewed reported that widespread use of fake documents, such as birth certificates, marriage certificates, and passports, presented challenges when verifying the identities of applicants and dependents.

The visa lottery program is unfair to immigrants who comply with United States immigration laws. Most family-sponsored immigrants currently face a wait of years to obtain visas, yet the lottery program pushes 50,000 random immigrants with no particular family

ties, job skills, or education ahead of these family- and employer-sponsored immigrants each year with no wait.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation should be overturned. I have introduced legislation to do just that. This Congress should bring it up for a vote.

There is a bipartisan effort to eliminate the visa lottery program. Forty-five bipartisan Members of Congress have already cosponsored this legislation, and it has twice passed the House: once under a Democrat majority in the 110th Congress as an amendment to the FY 2008 State/Foreign Operations Appropriations bill on the House floor and once in the 109th Congress as an amendment to H.R. 4437.

Democrat leadership this Congress blocked the same amendment from coming to the floor for a vote during the consideration of the FY 2010 State/Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. The Democrat-controlled House has not held a single hearing on the dangers posed by the visa lottery program during the 110th or 111th Congresses.

□ 1945

WE DON'T NEED MORE TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN; WE NEED A NEW STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the year 2009 ended 12 days ago, and many were glad to see it go. It was a very difficult year for American families as they struggled with the recession. It was also a very difficult year for our brave troops in Afghanistan. The death toll was 317. That was twice as many as the previous year, and it made 2009 the deadliest year of the war. We'd all like to believe that this year will be safer for our troops in Afghanistan, but it doesn't look like it will be that way. Our military leaders have already predicted that President Obama's decision to send 30,000 more troops will lead to an increase in violence this spring and summer.

Sadly, America's military families who have already sacrificed so very much must brace themselves for more as the attacks on our troops continue. Violent extremism is thriving in Afghanistan because of the crippled economy, the broken infrastructure, the lack of education and other social services, the breakdown in law and order, and the belief that the central government isn't doing nearly enough to help their people.

Mr. Speaker, there is no military solution to these problems. That's why I'm opposed to sending more troops to Afghanistan. We don't need new troops. We need a new strategy. We must start using the tools of smart security to improve the lives of the Afghan people and give them hope for a better future. One of the keys to this new strategy must be a civilian surge, a surge of experts and aid workers who can help the

Afghan people to rebuild their communities and to rebuild their country. Everyone seems to agree that this is a good idea. The President said it's a good idea. Our diplomats and military leaders in Afghanistan have said it's a good idea. The people of our country certainly know that it's a good idea.

However, the last supplemental appropriations bill, which I voted against, lacked significant funding for the civilian surge, and President Obama only mentioned it once in his address on Afghanistan at West Point. The numbers on the ground tell the story, Mr. Speaker. When I questioned Ambassador Eikenberry last month at a Foreign Affairs Committee hearing, he indicated that there will be 1,000 civilians in Afghanistan by the end of this month, but we will have 100,000 troops there soon. That's a ratio of 100 to 1. So we aren't getting the civilian surge that we were promised. The current strategy, in fact, of relying on the military option ignores what will really work in Afghanistan: A real commitment to economic development, humanitarian aid, and social services, better law enforcement to disrupt terrorist networks, and better governance and systems of justice. The Afghan people desperately need a better future and a reason to reject violent extremism. They need hope for a positive future.

Mr. Speaker, winning in Afghanistan is about winning the hearts and minds of the Afghan people. Smart security is the way to do that.

RON BUTLER DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Ron Butler, the long-time coach and athletic director of Ranger College in Ranger, Texas. This past Saturday, the school honored him with Ron Butler Day to thank him for his years of service to their community. Ron worked at Ranger College from 1964, when he was hired, until his retirement in the year 2000. During his tenure at the college, he filled many roles. He was the head coach of both the men's and women's basketball teams, head coach of the softball team, assistant coach and head coach of the football team, and also the athletic director.

Throughout much of his tenure, he held many of these jobs at the same time. Most remarkable about Coach Butler's time at Ranger were the unqualified achievements the school had in athletics. In almost every sport, Coach Butler's teams found success and championships. For a college as small as Ranger, this is a big deal. It is not a stretch to say that Dr. Bill Campion, the president of Ranger College, was right when he said, "I singlehandedly give credit for the reputation and success of Ranger College to Ron Butler."

Excelling in athletics enabled the school to continue to grow and build its reputation as one of the finest junior colleges in Texas and the Nation.

Beyond the wins and the championships, Coach Butler has touched 25 years of students and families. His unwavering dedication and commitment can be seen rippling through the lives of everyone who has played under him or served alongside him. And after all this, Coach Butler still continues to serve his school today, as a member of the Board of Regents.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to share with this great body a small story of someone who gave so much to so many. Ranger College and all of its alumni owe a great debt of gratitude to this man, and it is my honor to thank Coach Butler publicly tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REMEMBERING THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear a few days ago Rudy Giuliani, the former mayor of New York, say that there were no terrorist attacks during the Bush administration on U.S. soil. He later corrected that remark to say that there were no terrorist attacks on U.S. soil while President Bush was leading the country—except for just 9/11, only the terrorist attack on 9/11. And I realized that I was witnessing the birth of a new form of political discourse from the right wing in this country: The exception. The exceptional exception, the exception that proves the rule or disproves the rule, as the case may be.

So I'm expecting that in the future, we'll hear from the right wing the claim that no cities drowned under the Bush administration—except for New Orleans. And that there were no wars that were started by mistake under the Bush administration—except for the war in Iraq. And that the Bush administration added nothing to the Federal debt—except for \$4.5 trillion, which works out to \$15,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country. And that they respected all of our constitutional rights as Americans—except when they didn't. I think that we'll hear the Republicans claim that the Bush administration managed the economy quite well—except when they brought it to the brink of national bankruptcy.

In fact, they'll claim that the Bush-Cheney administration was a complete success—except for the fact that it was

an abject failure. In fact, what we learned in watching them for 8 years is that the reason why the Republicans hate government so much is because they're so bad at it. There are those people among us who lived through that terrible time and will look back on it, and they'll say that they'll vote for anybody on the ballot, absolutely anybody on the ballot with one exception, except if that person happens to be Republican.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE CLIMBING DEBT BURDEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You know, Mr. Speaker, I get a big kick out of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle who continue to beat on the Bush administration. I mean, we're not in the Bush administration. We are in the Obama administration. And the Obama administration this year has outlined a \$3.55 trillion budget. They always seem to come down when they talk about President Bush and his administration, some of the shortcomings—and there has never been an administration that didn't have some shortcomings—but they don't talk much about what's happened since they took power.

When the Democrats took over Congress less than 3 years ago, the national debt was under \$9 trillion. It went from \$9 trillion to \$10 trillion to \$11 trillion to over \$12 trillion. That's just in the last 3 years. They're spending money like it's going out of style. They have increased the national debt limit five times in just the last 3 years, and the increase of \$3.4 trillion is 38 percent-plus over what the national debt was when they took control of this Chamber and the other Chamber. It really bothers me when they talk about all this in retrospect and they don't pay any attention to what's going on now and what should be going on in the future.

They're talking about a national health care plan now that is going to cost, I believe, \$3 trillion over the next decade, and they're behind closed doors, trying to ram that thing through without really having even a conference committee. They're doing it with just the leaders, and they're doing it in a smoke-filled room with—well, maybe they don't smoke. But they are doing it in a closed room where nobody can see—not even C-SPAN, even though they promised that they would.

Now let's just look at what's happened since they took power with the

White House as well as the House and the Senate since January of 2009. They passed the state Children's Health Insurance Program Reorganization Act, which was \$73.3 billion. Then in February, they passed the stimulus bill, which has not worked. Unemployment, which was not supposed to go over 8 percent, went over 10 percent. Now it's at least 10 percent. And that bill was \$1.16 trillion when you include interest.

Also in February, they passed the Consolidated Appropriations Act, which was \$410 billion. When you add interest to it, it's \$625 billion. Then in June of 2009, they passed the defense supplemental, which was not a bad deal because we had to do something about our military personnel in combat around the world, protecting our freedoms. But in addition to what we were doing for our military personnel and defense, they had all kinds—I think they had 3,000 or 4,000 pork barrel projects stuck in there. Then in December, they passed a consolidated appropriations bill for fiscal year 2010 which was \$3.554 trillion.

Now the President has said just in the last couple of days, we have to do something about spending. Man, that is really, really a great statement. I wish he'd thought about that about a year ago when he first took office. But nevertheless, it's better to be aware of it now than to not do anything about it at all. But he's talking about cutting spending by between 3 and 5 percent on discretionary spending, and that's going to amount to—oh, maybe \$150 billion. But he's spending \$3.55 trillion. So you're still going to have about \$3.4 trillion, even if we were to cut spending by about 3 to 5 percent.

The spending is completely out of control. The health care bill they're talking about is not going to start providing coverage, benefits until 2013, and yet the taxes start right now, which means simply that the \$1 trillion they are talking about being the cost of that health care plan is not going to be \$1 trillion; it's going to be at least \$1.5 trillion. And if it's anything like other government programs that they have rammed through in the past, it will double that. And I really believe we are going to see a \$3 trillion cost to the health care bill in this next decade if they pass it.

I'm very hopeful that the Senate—some Senator, at least one or two—will see the light and realize the American people simply don't want that. The overwhelming majority of Americans don't want anything coming between them and their doctor, especially government. They don't want socialized medicine, and they don't want all this spending. They want to do what Ronald Reagan did back in the early 1980s when he came in, and the situation was even worse then. We had 12 percent unemployment. We had 14 percent inflation, a misery index of 26 percent—that's what they called it.

And Reagan came in, instead of raising taxes, as many of his advisers said

he should do, he said, No, no, I'm going to cut taxes. I'm going to cut taxes across the board for individuals, for businesses, for corporations, for industry. Because if we give them more of their tax money back, they'll be able to spend more on investment. They'll be able to spend more to buy cars and refrigerators and everything else. And as a result, the economy turned around, and we had a 20-year expansion of the economy, which was unparalleled in my lifetime.

Yet we haven't learned from John F. Kennedy, and we haven't learned from President Reagan. We're doing exactly the opposite. We're spending money like it's going out of style and coming up with new government programs which are going to cost jobs and dig us into a debt that we're never going to get out of. It's going to cause inflation and higher taxes. What we should be doing right now, as I have said on this floor many times, is we should go back to the Reagan and John F. Kennedy formula and cut taxes, give this economy a real shot in the arm by letting people keep more of their money, and you will see us create jobs. We won't have 10 percent unemployment in a year or two or three. It will be down. It will be going down. It will be going down fairly rapidly once this starts to take hold.

But as long as we just keep spending and spending and spending and digging ourselves into a deeper hole by coming up with new programs like this crazy health care bill they're talking about, we're never going to solve our problem. And our kids and our grandkids and the posterity of this country are going to look back and say, Why did you do this to us? Why did you do this to us?

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TAX BANKERS' BONUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, it is said that one out of every three American homeowners is underwater with their mortgage, meaning that they owe more on their mortgages than the house in which they live is worth. One out of every three Americans.

We know that this year there could be at least 8 million Americans actually losing their homes. We know there are 15 million Americans unemployed. There have been record numbers of foreclosures and also record numbers of business failures. There has been a

credit freeze. Some say that we have a jobless recovery, or a cashless recovery if you are an investor and you wait for your dividends because dividends aren't in at the moment, and perhaps even a homeless recovery where people are losing their homes, losing their jobs, losing the quality of their investments. And it is said that the economy is recovering.

What is going on in America? What is going on is the banks have taken enormous power during the last few years, and they have received that power from the Federal Government in the form of bailouts. I voted against the bailouts. I don't think the government should be picking winners and losers in the economy. And I also don't think that the government should serve as an engine to take the wealth of the Nation and accelerate it upwards, because that is exactly what has happened. Whether it has been a Republican or Democrat administration, that process of acceleration of the wealth is continuing.

Now U.S. banking companies have been the beneficiaries of unprecedented government money in the form of multiple, ongoing, taxpayer-financed Federal Government bailouts and subsidies, virtually unlimited access to money at near zero rates of interest, Federal purchases of impaired assets, low-cost loans, open-ended guarantees, all in the name of restoring normalcy to U.S. financial markets.

In the coming days, banks are expected to begin paying out substantial bonuses to top executives. The total amounts rival the payouts at the peak of the real estate bubble in 2007 and are set against a clear commitment of policy to strengthen the underlying health of the banking system by enabling banks to recapitalize. The bonuses being paid out could and should be directed primarily toward enhancing the capital base of the banking system. Banks could also use the profits to deal with unrecognized losses from real estate transactions and other imprudent investments to reduce outsized fees charged to struggling consumers, to increase lending to small- and medium-sized businesses, and for a variety of other purposes that would provide struggling Americans with a more vibrant and beneficial financial system.

Today, banks are earning outsized profits, not by lending or investing in the American economic prosperity, but by trading interest-free dollars taken from the Federal Reserve for other financial assets in the U.S. and around the world. And rather than use these profits to enhance the capital of the banks, they are being taken out in the form of bonuses to benefit certain individuals, corporate banking executives who have been more lucky than smart.

Now in order to staunch this leakage of corporate profits from bank reserves and shareholder capital, I have introduced H.R. 4414, The Responsible Banking Act, that would tax banks for the windfall bonuses they pay to their management, and the tax would be at 75 percent. We cannot let banks crush

businesses. We cannot let banks challenge this government with our own tax dollars. We need broad reform in our financial system, and I will be addressing that at another time. But one element of that reform must be to impose some fiscal discipline onto these banks that think that they can get away with giving themselves mega-bonuses while the rest of America is suffering and starved for capital.

Support H.R. 4414.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHERE IS THE TRANSPARENCY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank our leader for allowing me to spend this time this evening in talking to our colleagues about some very important matters dealing with health care reform and the pledge of transparency. That will be the focus of the hour. I have a number of colleagues that will be joining me who are part of an organization within the House of Representatives called the GOP Doctors Caucus. We have about 13 members of the GOP Doctors Caucus, most of whom are medical doctors. We have an optometrist, we have a clinical psychologist Ph.D., and a couple of dental doctors in the caucus.

And for the last year literally in the entire year 2009, I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that this GOP Doctors Caucus has been working diligently, working diligently to try to have some input in regard to health care reform, making some suggestions, writing and cosponsoring comprehensive legislation such as H.R. 3400, an alternative approach.

Members of this caucus, Mr. Speaker, introduced individual bills on certain subject matter that the President has pledged that would be in the health

care bill. And yet as we stand here today, at the 11th hour literally of merging these two versions from the House and the Senate, there is nothing about health care reform of the medical liability system which the President pledged to do.

The President, of course, made that pledge in Chicago at the annual meeting of the American Medical Association, an association that represents maybe a fifth, 20 percent, of the doctors across this country, that has literally given their endorsement to the President's bill, but asks in return for some relief of the reimbursement under Medicare to the physicians, elimination of this flawed formula that year after year after year forces the doctors to take these deep cuts so they literally can't afford to continue to see Medicare patients.

And of course the request, Mr. Speaker, at that particular meeting back in Chicago, probably last May or June of 2009, that there be some meaningful medical liability tort reform. The CBO in fact estimated that would save \$54 billion. Just that one issue would save \$54 billion the CBO says over the next 10 years, and I respectfully suggest that is a most conservative estimate on their part. I think there would be a \$54 billion savings each and every year over the next 10 years.

In any regard, I am blessed tonight to be joined by a number of the members of the GOP Doctors Caucus, and we are going to talk about the main theme of tonight and that is the issue of transparency. I want to get into that in just a second because nothing could be more important, particularly at this point, this 11th hour, when a bill is about to be presented. I say "presented," really I mean, Mr. Speaker, forced upon the 435 Members of this body and the 100 in the other body, when the American people don't want it; but more about that later.

MOMENT OF SILENCE RECOGNIZING COBB COUNTY TRAGEDY

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like with your approval to take just a moment because a tragedy occurred, and I was just notified by email just a few minutes before I started, that in my district, the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, Cobb County in one of its townships, Kennesaw, part of my nine-county district of northwest Georgia, there was a tragic, tragic shooting in my district, in the city of Kennesaw today, where two people lost their lives and three people are in critical condition.

I would like to ask my colleagues on the floor tonight to join me for just a moment of silence to remember the families of the deceased and the victims that are in critical condition and their families as well. We will take just a moment of silence before we continue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing us to do that, and I thank my colleagues for joining me in their prayers for those of my district who have been killed and injured.

Well, we want to talk a little bit about the issue of transparency because that is what is in the news right now—this is a huge concern—or I should say the lack of transparency in regard to the health reform bill. We are going to give you a second opinion today about that. And, indeed, we are going to roll the tape on health care doublespeak as we look at these slides.

Mr. Speaker, let me just start off by saying and calling the attention of my colleagues to this first slide: Where is the transparency?

Our President, then candidate, Senator Obama, in January 2008 on the campaign trail, and we all know what a great communicator President Obama and then-Senator, candidate Obama was, the best speaker, the best communicator, I think, that this country has possibly seen since the Great Communicator himself, Ronald Reagan. Here is what candidate Obama said in January of 2008, talking about health care: "I would put my plan forward and I would welcome input, but these negotiations would be on C-SPAN so the public will be part of the conversation and will see the choices that are being made." Presidential candidate Obama made that remark to the San Francisco Chronicle in January of 2008, almost 2 years ago.

Continuing on the campaign trail, candidate Barack Obama said about 8 months later in August of 2008 as the primaries were getting hot and heavy: "We will have the health care negotiations televised on C-SPAN so we can see who are making arguments on behalf of their constituents and who are making arguments on behalf of the drug companies or the insurance companies." That was at an Obama town hall meeting in August of 2008. Once again candidate Obama, now President Obama, saying it's time for the American people to see what's going on, see it with their own eyes, hear it with their own ears, use their own common sense to figure out, to connect the dots, to see why one group or another group might be supporting something that on the surface seems almost incredible that they would. Almost incredible that they would.

So I would say to President Obama today, as I said to him, or at least through the television set I said to him, right on, Mr. Candidate, you are absolutely right. The American people need to know. They need to have this opportunity of transparency.

Where is the transparency? Where is it?

President Obama, and he went on and we all know now ran a great, great campaign and beat a tough opponent in the primary and a war hero in the general election, certainly a well-deserved victory for President Obama. And then shortly after inauguration, January 21, 2009, about a year ago, President Barack Obama said this:

□ 2015

"My administration is committed to creating an unprecedented level of

openness in government. We will work together to ensure a system of transparency, public participation and collaboration. Openness will strengthen our democracy. And it will promote efficiency and effectiveness in government." Amen, brother. I agree with you, Mr. President. Unfortunately, we are not seeing it. We are not seeing it. Such a disappointment for the American people.

Well, here we are, colleagues on both sides of the aisle, here we are. We don't know exactly what is going on. Certainly we members on the Republican side, even leadership in the House and Senate on the Republican side, ranking members on the committees of jurisdiction on the Republican side, they are not meeting with anybody. They may be symbolically named as conferees at some point, if indeed we have a conference. My colleagues can talk about that. Maybe we won't have a conference.

But it is one thing to shut Members of Congress out and not allow them to represent their people. Almost 50 percent of the people are shut out by virtue of not including the minority party in any deliberations henceforth and to this point and to the final deliberations. And there are some serious issues, Mr. Speaker, that need to be resolved, that need to be resolved. The American people want to see this. They want to know. They want to have the opportunity.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my wife is not the only spouse in this United States House of Representatives who loves to watch C-SPAN at all hours of the day and night, because they are so unbiased, and they cut to the chase, and they treat people fairly, and they take questions from Democrats, and Republicans, and independents. And it is no nonsense. It is just the facts, ma'am, sir. C-SPAN televises many of the things that we do in this Chamber and in the other Chamber and the committees process. Brian Lamb, who has been with C-SPAN, I guess he is president and CEO, probably been there 20 years, an icon, really, wrote a letter just recently to the President of the United States.

And, Mr. Speaker, here is the letter from C-SPAN to the House and Senate leadership. "C-SPAN requests that you open all important negotiations, including any conference committee meetings, to electronic media coverage," so the American people can see, can connect the dots, can understand about the Louisiana Purchase, can understand about the Nebraska Compromise, or is it the Cornhusker Compromise, in which it seems to I think a lot of people out there on Main Street that maybe Nebraska got the corn and everybody else got the husks.

That is why we need openness and sunshine. And that is why Brian Lamb and C-SPAN are making this request. And that is what we are here to talk about tonight. And as I say, I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have some of

my colleagues in the GOP Doctors Caucus with us. I don't know in what order they arrived on the floor. But I want to yield to each of them as much time as they desire to let's have a little colloquy and talk about this issue, because this is so important. And indeed, we are at the eleventh hour.

Let me first recognize my good friend from Texas, my classmate, a fellow OB/GYN physician. I think between us we have probably delivered about 8,000 babies. And I know I have 26 years at it, and I know he has 17 years at it, so I will call on the gentleman from Texas, OB/GYN doctor and great member of this body, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for bringing this hour to the floor of the House tonight. I think it is important to talk about this issue. It is important to talk about opening the doors, opening the windows on this Congress, on this health care legislation.

We have seen this bill now take several forms over the past 12 months since the President was inaugurated. And certainly the bill that we had in committee, and Dr. GINGREY and I serve on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and we had this bill for several days in what is called a markup in committee. That was covered on C-SPAN. People got to see us argue, and Republican members attempt to amend the bill. Not many of those amendments were accepted, unfortunately. But nevertheless, it was an open process. And HENRY WAXMAN, the chairman of that committee, to his credit, did allow a relatively lengthy discussion on that legislation.

However, when we left for August and went through the very famous August recess and August town halls, we came back to Congress, I thought we would hit the pause button, I thought we would hit the resets button, I thought we would hit the rewind button on this legislation, but no such luck. The President came and talked to us here on the floor of the House and said this was going forward, it was going forward rapidly, there was no time to lose, no time to stop and study what we had done. We were simply going to push ahead.

So between that date, which was the middle of September, and the very first part of November, another bill was written. It was a different bill from what we had in the committee. It was a different bill than what Dr. GINGREY and I attempted to work on in committee. It was a bill that was essentially written in secret. It was written in the Speaker's suite of offices, heavy, heavy input from the White House.

But none of us saw the bill. And I mean to say none of us, none of us Republicans, nor in fact no Democrats who weren't in leadership, who weren't part of this process, this secret process in the Speaker's suite, none of them knew what was in this bill. So as a consequence, we had a bill come forward,

we had a very tumultuous week here in early November, and it culminated in the House bill passing on the floor of the House by a very slim margin, late in the night, late on a Saturday night in early November.

Then it goes over to the Senate, and the same thing. We had the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee mark up the bill in June. Then it went to the Senate Finance Committee. They never had a bill. They debated talking points, but then they did a bill. And then the final product was written in secret, in secret in Majority Leader REID's office with a heavy input, a heavy hand from the White House, and then came to the Senate floor, and famously was laid out for the Senators right before they left for Christmas Eve.

So it has been a process that has been draped and cloaked in secrecy really since it left the committee process July 31. The American people haven't had a chance to see it, rank and file Democrats haven't had a chance to see it, rank and file Republicans have had no chance to see it. None of us who are the so-called back benchers on both sides of the aisle, none of us had any part in drafting this legislation, or carrying this, or modifying this legislation after it left the committee. And that is important to remember.

The Rules Committee met here in the House late into the night. One amendment, one amendment was accepted, famously the one by BART STUPAK from Michigan, a Democrat, that dealt with the issue of abortion, funding of abortion in the bill. But one amendment out of the many hundreds that were offered during the course of that time it was in the Rules Committee, one amendment was made in order.

Many, many amendments we could talk about that had merit, that should have had an airing here on the floor of the House were never even considered. So we have a process that has been cloaked in secrecy. And so when it came out that, well, there is going to be some sort of reconciliation process, whether it is a formal conference or whether it is what is famously referred to now as a ping-pong match between the House and the Senate, there is going to be some coming together of these two very different pieces of legislation. And it is important.

So why not, at least at this point, open it up and open it up to the cameras, the C-SPAN cameras. They are not there with commentary. They are not there with an editorial agenda. They are simply there with their cameras to show the give and take. And the President, when he was running for office, thought this was so important he wanted to show the American people which representatives, which Members of Congress stood with the American people and which stood with the special interests. In fact, I would like to know that very thing myself, but we are prevented from knowing that.

Now, early in this process, in May or June of this past year, there were several of those special interests that met down at the White House. There were headlines that were made on those days, there were photographs taken, hands that were shaken, agreements that were made. \$2 trillion in excess has been wrung from our health care system by the insurance companies, the pharmaceutical companies, my AMA, the American Hospital Association, AdvaMed, the medical device manufacturers, and the Service Employees International Union, all of those six groups got together at the White House and gave up, they came to the White House to give up something to get this bill the momentum it would need. But none of that information has then subsequently been made available to us.

And thus you had situations occur, such as in the Senate Finance Committee, when a Senator asked legitimately, "Well, I thought we could tax this on the hospitals, but the hospitals say that wasn't part of the deal that they struck at the White House." Well, what is that deal that they struck at the White House? We are the legislators. We should be privy to that very information so that when we write the legislation we can do so with the full knowledge.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman. Certainly carrying along that same theme is an example, the Big Pharma, a willingness to contribute \$80 billion toward the success of this program to reduce the cost of the doughnut hole for those who have Part D prescription drug part and they get in that donut hole. The question needs to be asked and the American people need to understand, well, what does Big Pharma get in return for that? The gentleman from Texas said the same thing in regard to the American Medical Association and the 250,000 members of that organization. What in effect do they get by endorsing this program? And the American Health Insurance Plans and the American Hospital Association and on and on and on.

AARP, the American Association of Retired Persons, that represents 40 million people in this country, you would think that when you have got a health program, Mr. Speaker, in both the House version and the Senate version that is cutting \$500 billion out of the Medicare program, which already has an unfunded liability over the next 75 years of \$35 trillion, why in the world would an organization who is supporting seniors who depend so much on Medicare support a program that is going to cut that program to the bone 10 percent per year, Mr. Speaker, over the next 10 years and 17 percent per year on the Medicare Advantage program? Why would that organization?

So again, these are rhetorical questions. And as the gentleman from

Texas is saying, the American people and C-SPAN says indeed, let's put some sunshine on this and let people connect the dots and figure out, well, oh, yeah, now I see, now I understand. Make some sense out of it.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, and the good news is that this is information that we need as legislators, the American people need to see to make up their minds as to whether or not this is good legislation or not. We have a tool at our disposal. The tool is called a resolution of inquiry. And a resolution of inquiry can be filed at the committee level. And a resolution of inquiry has to be, after it is filed, has to be dealt with in 14 legislative days.

I filed a resolution of inquiry for these documents down at the White House, that were arrived at down at the White House in May and June. I filed a resolution of inquiry right as we left December 17. The resolution is H. Res. 983 for anyone who might want to look that up on Thomas. And our Committee on Energy and Commerce will have 14 legislative days to deal with this.

□ 2030

Now, my expectation is that the committee will simply quash it. That may be, but at the same time I feel it is our obligation, as dutiful members of the minority, to bring to the American people some of these discrepancies.

Now, part of the good news there is when I filed this, an article that was written in *The Hill* the day that we left town in December talked about this Resolution of Inquiry and had some interesting quotes from our chairman, HENRY WAXMAN, on the resolution. And quoting from an article by Molly Hooper in *The Hill* on December 17, Mr. WAXMAN said, "If there are such documents, Burgess should get them. I don't know if there are such documents. I think some of the things he wants are not written down, and different people have different ideas of what was agreed," WAXMAN told *The Hill* on Wednesday before Congress adjourned.

I don't know either whether anything was written down, but the Resolution of Inquiry is there for a reason. I have been informed by House legislative counsel that they cannot recall having done a Resolution of Inquiry on a health care subcommittee, but this is important. This is important stuff.

So this is one more tool at our disposal. The committee has to act on it. Probably it will mature sometime in early February. We are working so few days in January, the 15 legislative days likely will take us into February. It will either be forwarded from the committee to the floor of the House or it will be quashed in committee, which is what I expect will happen. But nevertheless, it is one of those things that we should be talking about because it is our obligation to bring some of these things to the floor on this discussion.

Before anyone criticizes me by saying, "Well, why didn't you speak up

when George Bush had a meeting with energy executives?" for one thing, I wasn't here when then-President Bush convened that meeting. But I don't recall President Bush in his campaign saying, "Energy is so important that I will bring all the leaders in energy into the White House and I will open it up to C-SPAN." I don't recall him saying that. He never promised to open it up to C-SPAN.

Now, President Obama, when he was running, had referenced the Clinton administration and some of the missteps when they attempted to take over health care and the 500 people who were locked in a room to produce a bill. He thought that was wrong. He thought that was a problem that the bill had because it was conceived in secret, and it should have been conceived in the full openness of sunlight in the legislative process. I agree with that. I, for one, am looking forward to the day that we elect a President who has the courage to stand up and say to the American people that he is going to put 500 doctors in a room and make them come up with a way to pay lawyers and he's not going to let them out until they come up with something. I would like to see that happen.

I do thank the gentleman for bringing this issue up. It's an important issue, and I know there are other people who wish to speak on it.

I yield back to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to yield time to a fellow member of the GOP Doctors Caucus and actually a member of the Georgia Caucus, a fellow physician who has a practice, a doctor who actually makes house calls, the gentleman from Athens and Augusta, Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY, for yielding.

I have a 19-year-old son. His name is Paul Collins Broun III. We affectionately call him "Bear." Collins and his friends have a peculiar type of language. They talk about something being "bad." Well, to me, if it's bad, it's bad, but when they say something's bad, they really mean that it's good. Well, we've developed a similar kind of language here in the leadership of this House, in the leadership of the Senate, as well as the leadership down Pennsylvania Avenue at the White House. When they say something is transparent, they mean opaque. When they say that there is a new era of openness, that means secrecy. That is exactly what we're seeing. It's unfair to the American public. It's unfair to their representatives, both Democrat and Republican alike.

We have a newspeak here in Washington. It's a newspeak where transparency actually means opaque and obscure, where the American people are being kept in the dark, where major policies are being proposed that are going to radically change how health

care—as well as every aspect of life in America—is going to be done, and it's not fair. The American people need to stand up and say no. They need to say no to this newspeak. They need to say, Mr. President, NANCY PELOSI, Madam Speaker, HARRY REID, Mr. Majority Leader, we want openness. We want transparency. We want a new era of open government so that the American people can understand what's going on up here in Washington.

It's absolutely critical that the American people stand up and speak to the leadership and demand something different, that the American people demand that nothing is passed, particularly on health care, that is going to radically change the economic future of our country, that is going to radically change the way people live because anything and everything can be brought under the aegis of health care. I think probably we are going to see way beyond the things that are going on today where government is trying to control what we eat, how we live, what kind of car we drive.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, even so, we're talking about one-sixth of the whole economy of this great country of ours, and it's going to expand.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, this is not about health care. It's about the government. It's about government control. It's about government telling people how to live, government making decisions for us. It's taking away our liberty. And we see right now New York City is trying to control the amount of salt in everybody's food.

This health care plan can tell us what kind of car to drive, whether we can own guns or not to protect ourselves and our home, whether we can teach our children the way that we, as parents, believe that our children ought to be taught.

This is the largest takeover of liberty and freedom this country has ever seen. The American people need to stand up and say no to this obscure, opaque, secret process that this leadership of this House and the Senate across the other side of the Capitol and the administration, the Obama administration, and the leadership are doing, because it is totally, totally against everything that this country stands for.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, just for a second.

The American people—and I think that my colleagues would agree with me—the American people have spoken, haven't they?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. They really have.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Over 60 percent of them are vehemently opposed to this government takeover that Dr. BROUN is talking about.

I will make one other comment before yielding back to my friend, and that is that the Speaker herself—Mr. Speaker, you're in her stead in the chair this evening, but the Speaker, back in 2006 on the campaign trail when your party did indeed take over the majority, Mr. Speaker, Madam Speaker—minority leader at the time—said to the American people, You give us an opportunity to take back over control of the leadership of this Congress, this House of Representatives, and you will see the most open process you have ever seen. It will be a breath of fresh air. That sun will be shining in. The American people will come up and the children will sit around as I'm sworn in and they will be right there at my knee and I will be patting them on the head, Mr. Speaker, she said. And it will be wonderful. Happy days are here again. Well, when you say something like that—and I think my colleagues agree with me, Mr. Speaker—you need to deliver.

Now, she could have said, back in 2006 on the campaign trail, These rotten Republicans who have run this place for 12 years and they haven't given us a fair shake. Man, you give us an opportunity, put us back in, when we get there, we are going to roll them at every opportunity. Well, she would have been speaking the truth, Mr. Speaker. Madam Speaker would have been speaking the truth. That's what she should have done because that's what she did. We have no openness here. It's kind of like our current President said, you know, a change you can believe in.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think this is the change the American people were expecting, and they certainly don't believe in it.

I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, Dr. GINGREY, thanks for yielding back.

And you are exactly right, the American people were promised many things by this Speaker: transparency, openness, the new era of a clean government with a prosecution of corruption. Nothing could be further from the truth. This Speaker has not fulfilled those promises to the American people.

The American people need to stand up and understand that they are really in control. The Constitution of the United States, which I believe in as it was originally intended, starts off with three very powerful words. In fact, I have a copy in my pocket. I carry a copy all the time. It starts off with three powerful words, "We the people." This is the government that is supposed to be for the people, by the people, as President Lincoln said.

The people have the power. They have the power to demand openness. They have the power to demand transparency and stop this secrecy and stop the veil that's going on up here. In fact, I challenge any Democrat in this House or in the Senate to show me anywhere in this document that we have the authority, constitutionally,

to take over the health care system. It's not here. I challenge any Democrat to show me in the Constitution where we have the authority to pass this health care bill that they're taking. They won't find it. It's not there.

The American people can demand from their elected representatives within the House or the Senate something different than we have today. Former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen once said when he feels the heat, he sees the light. What he means by that is when the people who elect him, or reelect him, contact him and say, You're headed in the wrong direction. You need to head in a different direction, when enough people contact him, that's putting heat upon the elected representative. The elected representative, if he wants to be reelected, will start paying attention to enough of those phone calls, emails, faxes, and visits and will start seeing the light.

We need to shine the light of day. The American people can control the light in their hand right now today by getting on the telephone, getting on their computer, by calling their Representatives, by calling their Senators, their district offices or their offices up here, and saying no to this government takeover of health care, saying no to this obscure, secretive process that NANCY PELOSI, HARRY REID, and Barack Obama are undertaking, and saying yes to the openness and transparency we have been promised by Ms. PELOSI as well as Mr. Obama.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman, I want to continue in just a second and introduce our next speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee and a fellow OB/GYN physician, Dr. PHIL ROE. But the gentleman from Athens, Georgia, is absolutely right. And as he pulled out his pocket Constitution—and I'm so proud of him for keeping it with him at all times because there are things in this bill that we think, Mr. Speaker, and I think the American people feel are unconstitutional, that are unconstitutional. I hope Dr. ROE will speak of that. These issues are so important at this 11th hour to not let the American people see the process for Madam Speaker and the Democratic leadership and the President. I showed you all the quotes at the outset of the hour, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, and you know he said it, she said it. It's time to deliver.

I yield to my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY.

A little over a year ago, I stood on this House floor and was sworn in for the first time in the 111th Congress, one of the proudest days of my life. It goes up there with my marriage, the birth of my grandchildren and children. It was a very proud day to be here.

I came from a background of local government, and in Tennessee, where we're from, I was the mayor of Johnson City, Tennessee, and was a city commissioner and local official. In that

State, we have a sunshine law. Everything that is discussed is discussed in the open. It cannot be discussed in our local city government. We have five officials. We cannot discuss anything between ourselves unless we are in the open. That means an open, scheduled meeting that has been published or with a TV camera on.

Let me tell you what happens, Mr. Speaker. When that happens, you get a better government and you get a better product when the sun shines on it.

□ 2045

I will tell you that one of the great disappointments I have had is when I woke up near Christmas Eve and found that one of the Senators had voted for a health care bill to exempt a State that other States are going to have to obey on. I was absolutely nauseated with that. It is the most unbelievable thing. It made me ashamed to be a Member of this great body, and I shouldn't be. I should be proud. Every Member should be proud and honored to belong here. We lecture Hamid Karzai in Afghanistan about corruption. Let him turn around and look at our government and say, Wait a minute. For enough money, you can get your vote bought off to do something. If that health care bill had had legs, it should have stood on its own. Let me explain to you what that means for other States, and let me explain to the American people what that means for the State of Tennessee.

Right now, we have 50 fewer State troopers than we had in 1977, and we have 2 million more people. For the safety of our State, we can't afford Medicaid, which this bill in the Senate does. If it is accepted without going back to the Senate and goes straight to the President, we will have 15 million more people who will have Medicaid. With that comes an obligation from the State to pay for that. We don't have any money to pay for it in Tennessee. Right now, our colleges do not have one capital improvement project on a single college campus—the University of Tennessee and all of the 26 board of regents colleges—not one dormitory, not a library, not a chemistry department, not anything. Right now, we can't add any more people to our local Medicaid and Medicare plans.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.—Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be a bit surprised if some of the teachers in the great State, the volunteer State, are having to take furloughs and leaves of absences and are having to work short days and that kind of thing.

I yield back.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Where do we go? Do we cut K through 12? We're already in the 40s in education.

Here is another unfunded mandate that comes to the State of Nebraska, and the people in Nebraska don't have to pay for that. The people of Texas do.

The people of Ohio do. The people of California do. The people of Maine do. This is something that should not be there. When the sun shines on this, this will not happen. That is why it is extremely important for the sun to shine on this process.

You mentioned a moment ago, when you peel this onion back and when you begin to read this bill—and I've read every page of the House bill. I have not read the 2,700 pages of the Senate bill—we look at the AARP. When you sell, there will be an insurance exchange, and on this insurance exchange, if a company trades on there—and this is a private company—their CEO will be limited to a \$500,000 salary, which is tax deductible. That's fine. That company ought to be able to decide what it pays its CEO. If you pay more than that, you have to pay corporate taxes of 35 percent plus ordinary income taxes of 39 percent. So, for anything over \$500,000, the government will get three-fourths of it—except if you are the CEO of AARP. If you are the CEO of AARP, you make \$1.55 million a year. The average Social Security recipient receives about \$12,000 a year. That's their business, but they are exempted from this bill. They are not included in this bill. So guess what happened? AARP endorsed this bill. I can go on and on.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.—I want him to go on and on because he has got a lot of facts to present.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is about AARP and other organizations and about wanting the people to have the opportunity to see for themselves with their eyes and to listen to the debate with their ears and to figure it out with common sense and to connect the dots. I mean, AARP, you know, do they make some money off the deal?

I do want to make one point, before yielding back to the gentleman from Tennessee, recognizing the good people of Nebraska—the Corn Husker State—and coach Tom Osborne, who is a former Member of this body, a great colleague, a friend of ours who is now the athletic director at the University of Nebraska. It's a great, great State. To their great credit, the Governor said, We don't want it. We don't want this sweetheart deal. This is not right.

I commend him, and I commend the State of Nebraska for understanding. Mr. Speaker, the inequity, the realization that the sweetheart deal for them means crumbs and bacon bits for everybody else. They understand that. Of course, now the Senator who was able to effect this sweetheart deal is saying, No, let's not rescind the deal. Let's just give the deal to everybody. Then what's going to be the true cost? Instead of \$1.2 trillion, it will be \$2 trillion; but anyway, I digress a bit.

Let me yield back to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As you go through this bill, the people who do get it are our seniors. I saw a lot of senior patients, as did you, and as I went home and spent these last couple of weeks over the break meeting with hundreds, if not thousands, of people during that time and talking to them one on one, let me tell you what they do get:

They do get the fact that you're going to take in the next 10 years almost \$500 billion out of a Medicare plan that does not pay its premiums in 2017. Seven short years from now, it will not pay for the obligation that we have now, and we are going to add 3 to 3.5 million seniors beginning in 2011 when the baby boomers hit. So that's 30 to 35 million more people with \$500 billion less money. Let me explain to you three things that will happen.

One is you will decrease access. And when you decrease access, you will decrease quality. Third, you are going to increase the cost for our seniors. They get it. They do understand that, and they understand they're going to pay more for needed care that they may not be able to get. That's the other reason. As people begin to understand what is in this bill, they push back.

Just today, Dr. GINGREY, as I was leaving home—and this has been consistent throughout my district—a poll was published in the local newspaper that showed in our district, the First District of Tennessee, that 79 percent of the people did not want this current bill, this current legislation. This is 8 out of 10. We'd better start listening to the people of this Nation. They have been screaming as loudly as they can. They want to be heard. I am afraid, right now, we are not listening to them. They want meaningful health care reform; 435 Members of this body want meaningful health care reform. We don't want to interfere with the doctor-patient relationship, and we can do that. We should be able to discuss that openly, and the cameras and the lights should shine upon those decisions.

I yield back, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

I wanted to also mention a couple of responses from the White House in regard to the present CEO of C-SPAN requesting that the negotiations, whatever they are—whether there is a ping-pong back and forth between the House and the Senate or a mini conference or a full conference, whatever the deal is, for goodness sakes, let the American people see it. Even if they shut us Republicans out, let the American people have the opportunity. C-SPAN said, Look, we will provide all of the equipment—the digital—just as they do in this Chamber.

On the Sunday Morning show, Mr. Speaker—and I'm sure most of us watch it. I watch it every Sunday—here is what the press secretary, the Honorable Robert Gibbs, said on January 5, 2010. The reporter asked: Did the President regret making that earlier

promise to broadcast meetings on C-SPAN? Robert Gibbs' response: The President's number one priority is getting a bill through the House and the Senate.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we get that.

Let's get ourselves out of this hole that we've dug at any cost, with any sweetheart deal, whatever we have to do to get 60 votes. Let's pass this darned thing so that I can stand up here at the State of Union and declare victory. We can all pound our chests and do the high fives and the knuckle to knuckle, or however you do that these days, and declare victory and, for goodness sakes, move on to something else because this is killing us.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, if and when that happens, it is going to kill the American people. I have great concerns, and my colleagues do as well.

I yield back to the gentleman from Athens, Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you and our colleague from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, were talking about the Senate bill and as you went on, it just occurred to me that I spoke just earlier about the Newspeak in the leadership in Washington—in the House and the Senate as well as in the Presidency—and about how “transparency” now means being obscure and opaque and how “openness” means being in secret.

As to the deals that are being struck, from everything we understand in my language, when people are threatened with harm if they don't go in a certain direction, that's called “extortion.” If somebody is offered a perk or money or something for going in a particular direction, that's called a “bribe” if one accepts it.

Mr. Speaker, we're having a lot of extortion and a lot of bribery going on in this process. I will repeat that. There is a lot of extortion and bribery going on in this process, and the American people deserve better. The American people deserve more. They need to stand up and reject this process of secrecy, of obscurity, of opaqueness, of broken promises, and of everything that we see going on in this House.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield back to me, I want to point out to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that I realize our time is limited.

As we conclude our hour, the gentleman didn't mince any words. We know that, my colleagues, and I love him for that. He speaks plainly; he is blunt; and you can understand him unlike the typical politician, but what he is talking about are things like—and we mentioned it—the Corn Husker kickback. We're having fun with these names.

One-hundred million dollars for Nebraska's support of Obama health care. I credit the Governor of Nebraska who says, No, we don't want it. God bless him. The Louisiana purchase: \$300 million to purchase the Louisiana vote. That's about 12 million more dollars than it cost to purchase the whole Lou-

isiana Territory in current dollars. UCONN: \$100 million for Connecticut's support. I guess that's Mr. CHRIS DODD of the Obama health reform. Gatorade: 800,000 seniors in Florida get to keep their Medicare Advantage.

What about the other 10.2 million seniors in the rest of the country? What about the 175,000 in my great district, the 11th District of Georgia? What happens to them? Mr. Speaker, they get pushed under the bus. That's what's happening to them. It's not right.

Well, here is what the American people think. Here is what they think. I know the President knows this, and I know the Democratic majority knows this, and I know that's why they want to pass this thing in the dark of night. They don't want C-SPAN looking in. They don't want Republicans looking in. They don't want the American people looking in. They want to get out of that hole and get out of town. That's what their plan is.

Obama's health care marks hit a new low as 54 percent disapprove of Obama's handling of health care and only 36 approve. Look at his overall approval rating going back to February of 2009, Mr. Speaker, when it was 61 percent. Let's just fast-forward here over on this slide to January of 2010, and we are talking about 46 percent. Scary times for the majority party. Scary times for this President. But scarier times for the American people.

We hear this expression all the time. Mr. President said it himself: It is time to press the reset button in dealing with Vladimir Putin, the Russian President. It is time to reach out with an unclenched fist to Ahmadinejad, this dictator over in Iran, who is trying to develop a nuclear weapon despite all of our pleadings and reaching out with an open hand. It is time to push the reset button with Kim Jong Il in North Korea.

□ 2100

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest this time to push the reset button with the American people, and give them a fair shake and be honest with them and tell them what is in this bill, these 2,500 pages that they can't understand. They could if they had time or if they had an opportunity, and C-SPAN is trying to give them that opportunity to shine the light of day on this process.

That is what it is all about. That is what Madam Speaker promised. That is what this President promised. It is time for them to deliver.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield a few more minutes, whatever time remains, to my good friend from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Very quickly, Mr. Speaker, I think what the American people want for us to trust is transparency. The people have to trust us for us to govern, and they can't trust us if they don't know what is going on.

I know, Mr. Speaker, you went home, I went home for the holidays; and they

said, What is going on with the health care bill? And I told them, You know as much as I do. Because we are in the dark just as you are. And that is not the way it ought to be.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I thank the gentleman from the great State of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, we thank all for the opportunity for the members of the GOP Doctors Caucus to spend some time tonight to explain to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle what our concerns are. I think we did it in a very fair way. We did it in a way that is not a personal attack on any individual, any Member of this body, any member of the administration. We are just asking to give the American people a fair shake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HEALTH CARE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUIGLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue much as we have done over this past hour, talking about this same issue, the health care bill that is now before the House and Senate, even though none of us have seen the finished product, and what has happened on the issue of transparency over these past several weeks since the House adjourned in the middle of December.

I am going to talk a little bit more about the resolution of inquiry because I believe that is an important tool that is available to the minority Members of the House. And I think it is a tool that we need to use, a tool that we need to exercise in order to get the American people the information that they are going to need to make up their minds about this bill.

If time permits, we will talk a little bit about some of the structural issues, some of the procedural issues that still are yet to occur if this bill indeed passes and is signed into law: What are the ramifications thereof? When will things happen? What will occur at the level of the Federal agency at the Department of Health and Human Services?

But I thought, first, it might be useful just to do a brief recap of where we have been this past year.

As most of us know, it has been not quite a year since the inauguration took place here in January of 2009, a historic day. A record number of people came and stood to watch the inauguration and to hear the speeches that occurred that day.

We had a very spirited campaign during the fall. We had the appearance, for the first time, of some rather stark economic news that hit the headlines and perhaps dictated some of the course of the campaign, and certainly

dictated some of the course of the very early legislative process in this body.

I will tell you, as someone who watched the campaign of 2008 for President, as someone who watched that very closely and was very interested in the health care policy aspects of that campaign, I was, frankly, surprised. When the campaign came to a conclusion and the votes were counted and the President won, I was surprised that there was not a bill that was almost ready to come to either the Senate Finance Committee or one of the committees of jurisdiction on the House side.

I rather expected that to be the Senate Finance Committee, because in October of 2008, Senator BAUCUS, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, convened several stakeholders over in the Library of Congress in the Members' briefing room there, had a day-long session, and took testimony and began, for all the world, to look like he was crafting a health care bill; produced a white paper shortly thereafter that, for all the world, looked like it was going to be a health care bill.

So after the election, I thought that we would see, relatively quickly, the introduction of at least some draft language as to what this health care bill was going to—what form it was going to take now that the election was over.

We all remember the election. Senator MCCAIN had his ideas on health care. We might come back to those in just a moment, because some of that, we are back to the future now with some of those same tax issues that are now being raised by the Democrats as a means to pay for the Democratic health care bill. They are talking about using some of the same procedures that Senator MCCAIN was talking about during the fall of 2008. So that is a little bit of irony, when they spent so much money blasting the Presidential candidate on the Republican side over his approach to health care.

But we heard President Obama's approach. He said there was going to be a mandate to cover children. He said there was not going to be an employer mandate nor would there be an individual mandate, but that anyone who didn't have insurance would be able to have insurance just as good as a Member of Congress under a program like the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program.

So those were the issues that were discussed and the platform that the President produced during the campaign. Then we had the election. I again was surprised that no bill came forward. I thought perhaps that Christmas of 2008 we might see from perhaps one of the Senators or from someone on the House side, again, at least a draft or an outline or some structure of what this bill was ultimately going to resemble.

Then everyone came back to town for the swearing in in early January of 2009. We stayed around for the inau-

guration. Three weeks later, the inauguration occurred. And I thought, well, very quickly now we will see some structure on the health care bill.

Now, arguably, there was a great deal of difficulty with the economy. The stock market was in free-fall in those days shortly after the inauguration, and there was a sense of urgency to do something about the economy.

I think the wrong decisions were made in February. But, in all honesty, I think the wrong decisions were made in September and October of 2008, when President Bush put forward the economic stabilization plan and Secretary Paulson, then-Secretary of the Treasury, put forward the economic stabilization plan that they proposed in late September of 2008. I thought those ideas were wrong. I thought the stimulus bill was wrong in February.

In fact, when you look back over this year and you look at the expenditure of political capital on that stimulus bill, had the health care bill been ready to go, had there been anything more than just rhetoric during the campaign, and had there actually been legislative language laid down or at least legislative principles developed from which legislative language could be developed; if we had taken that health care bill up in February, because of the enormous popularity that the President enjoyed in those early days after the inauguration, I think that the President could have pretty much gotten whatever he wanted during those early days. But the decision was made, for whatever reason, not to do that, but to go forward with the stimulus; and that is the legislation that came out of February.

We also had a bit of a disconnect with the nomination for the Cabinet Secretary position for Health and Human Services and the name originally put forward. In fact, that individual had cleared through the Senate committees that were necessary to confirm that individual. But then, for problems that no one could have foreseen, that individual withdrew his name from consideration, and we went for several months without an agency head at Health and Human Services. And I think you can see during that interval that the agency did suffer from not having anyone at the helm at that point of that organization, because, obviously, Secretary Leavitt left upon the completion of the Bush Presidency, and there was no name at that point even to be confirmed by the Senate. So it was problematic that there was not a Cabinet Secretary named for Health and Human Services. And I think, in fairness, that did cause some of the delay on the health care front.

We had, of course, as will always happen during the course of our legislative year here, we had things that happened around the world, things that happened in this country. We had a novel flu, H1N1, that came on the scene that took a lot of attention and time and discussion. We still had problems with the economy. No bill was produced during all this time.

Now, when the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee met in June for the first time, they began to hear and began to mark up a bill in the Senate committee. And that was really the first glimpse that the American people had of what this new administration and what this new Congress was going to do as far as health care policy, and it was startling. It was a startling revelation because the cost and coverage numbers that came out of the Congressional Budget Office were some of those first passes through the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee in the other body, some of the cost and coverage numbers were quite startling.

The cost was quite high, the coverage numbers were quite low, still leaving many people in this country uninsured; and there was quite a scramble to try to adjust things, try to pull the costs down and try to bring the coverage numbers up. In fact, we saw that evolve over the next several months, not just in June, as the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee dealt with the bill, but on into the summer when the three committees in the House who have jurisdiction over the bill, as they dealt with the bill, and then finally the Senate Finance Committee for the last part of the bill. We saw quite a bit of maneuvering and some magic numbers occurred.

We have got to keep the cost under \$1 trillion. I think \$900 billion is where everyone generally agrees they want to keep that number. And if you exclude people who are in the country without the benefit of a Social Security number, we have got to insure in excess of 90 percent, perhaps 93 or 94 percent. Bearing in mind that 85 percent are insured today, we want to get that number up to 90, 92, 93 percent for that cost of nearly \$1 trillion over 10 years.

So there was a lot of maneuvering around cost and coverage. Cost and coverage really hadn't been a discussion during the campaign of 2008. Cost and coverage really wasn't a discussion around the time of the inauguration. But cost and coverage really stole the show during the summertime.

Now, that was complicated because we had just gone through a terribly, terribly difficult budgetary process in the House and in the Senate, and the deficit numbers were higher than anyone ever thought possible, that anyone thought that they would ever see in their lifetime. So we were already dealing with a budget that was literally bursting at the seams, and then we found a \$1 trillion price tag on this bill that came out of the Senate.

And then, for reasons that I just simply cannot explain, the leadership of the House of Representatives decided in June, while all this drama was unfolding with the Senate. Well, we will just do the cap-and-trade bill. We will just do this energy bill and raise taxes on energy, and maybe that will help us offset some of the cost of this health care bill. It was the darnedest thing I had ever seen.

We had marked up a bill in committee. It seemed pretty terrible to my observation during the committee process, but nevertheless we marked up a bill that was voted out of committee, and then it just lay there for about a month. It was like no one wanted to touch it. People were stepping around it. No one wanted to actually address this cap-and-trade bill.

Then, suddenly, it was brought to life, brought back from the dead, literally, and passed within less than a week's time here on the House floor. And we passed it late in the day right before we left for the 4th of July recess. After the news shows and the news cycle was over for that weekend, we passed that cap-and-trade bill.

I remember walking out of this House. It was a scant number of votes. There really were not a lot of the excess votes that the Speaker had for that cap-and-trade bill. And I remember walking out of here, and this was not a good feeling of what the House just did.

I have got to tell you, when I got home to my district on Saturday morning, just 12 hours later, the people in my district were up in arms about what the House had done. Even though I had voted against the cap-and-trade bill, there was a lot of anxiety and, in fact, anger in my district because I hadn't stopped this legislative travesty from coming forward. And what in the world did Congress think it was doing with passing this type of energy tax when the country was faced with this severe a recession?

We just had a summer before where gasoline prices had gone through the roof. We perhaps got a little bit of relief there, but it was only because the economy had faltered, but at least energy prices were down. And, now, you are going to raise taxes on energy to put us right back where we were the year before? I don't think so.

So a lot of Members came back here from that July recess significantly set back by what their constituents had told them during the recess over the July 4th weekend.

You can just imagine, Mr. Speaker, walking in your 4th of July parade. You are somewhere behind the American Legion, in front of the Cub Scouts. And as you are walking down Main Street in one of the cities in your district, people are yelling at you from the side about this bill that you passed. And nobody read the bill. That had been over the news. And people were yelling: Next time, read the bill, and even adding adjectives to those exhortations.

So many Members of Congress came back a little bit shaken by what they had encountered in their districts because of some of the actions that Congress had taken.

People thought nobody would notice about us passing a cap-and-trade bill late on a Friday afternoon or late on a Friday night right before a holiday break, but the American people were

engaged. The American people were paying attention. And as a consequence, as we worked our way through July, remember, the big scheme or the big plan was that we were going to take this bill up in the three House committees, my committee of Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Ways and Means, Committee on Education and Labor.

Those three committees were going to take up identical bills, work through them, pass them out of their committees, and then we were going to bring the health care bill to the House floor, vote on it right before the August recess, was the plan, and then we would all go home for the August recess having passed this massive health care bill.

□ 2115

Well, it didn't work out like that. Now, the time for the markup in committees was significantly condensed. Although, no, we're not supposed to talk about process too much, I will tell you this is the type of legislation that really, yeah, it's going to take months. My understanding is—I was not here in 1990 when the Clean Air Act was passed, but it was my understanding it was a months-long markup process in Energy and Commerce. That's the way it should be.

This is complicated legislation. It's going to affect a lot of aspects and a lot of people's lives. There really was not a reason to rush this through unless you didn't want anybody to know what you were doing. And that's the impression that the American people got from this Congress, that we were trying to do it fast so we could sneak something through before anyone really realized what had happened to them, just as we did with cap-and-trade. But because we did it with cap-and-trade, the American people said, Aha, not so fast, and you saw Members begin to waver. And they wavered just enough so that the bill did not pass out of all three committees until we were right up against the August recess.

The bill passed out of my Committee of Energy and Commerce, which was the final of the three committees to mark the bill up. I think we got more time than any of the other committees. Some just had a single day, a 24-hour period, to mark up this complex and complicated legislation. We had at least had several days, though there were several of those days that we didn't actually work while the Democratic leadership tried to fine-tune the bill and take some of the rough spots out of it. But we did have at least a period of time in our committee to read the bill, become familiar with it, and then it passed.

One of the myths that I should dispel is that the Republicans were not involved in the process. Republicans have been involved in the process from day one. Number one, I was involved in the campaign in 2008. I talked to the transition team right after the election and

said, Health care is going to be important this year. I know something about that. I would like to be consulted as you write this legislation. I went to my chairman with the same comments. I didn't give up a 25-year medical career to sit on the sidelines while Congress deals with a bill that affects most of my friends back home who are physicians. No. I wanted to be involved in that process, but we never were.

We were never asked. We were never consulted. We were vilified along the way that we had no ideas and that we would not offer ideas. I had 50 amendments—50 amendments that I offered in committee, in the Energy and Commerce Committee. Now, some of them were great amendments, some of them were relatively modest amendments, but every one designed to improve what I thought was a bad bill. Now, it was still likely to be a bad bill at the end of the process, I was likely to vote against it, but at least it would be a better bad bill as it came out of committee than it would have been had there been no input.

Now, in fairness, the committee did ultimately accept several of my amendments, and several of my amendments were put in the House bill as we passed it out of committee July 31. Unfortunately, those all left the bill some time after that when the bill went to the Speaker's office to be rewritten. But I appreciate the fact that the committee was able to or was willing to accept at least a few Republican ideas.

Then the bill goes to the Speaker's office. A great deal of mystery surrounding it. Where is the health care bill? No one knows. No one knows what's going to happen to it. Are we going to get it the first of October, are we going to get it the middle of October? Remember, the President came right here to the House of Representatives and spoke to a joint session. It had the Senate and the House, both sides. You may remember there was some excitement that night because of some debate that occurred on the floor during the President's speech. But the President said, I welcome ideas from both sides. I want Republicans to offer ideas. But when we offered ideas, the sound of crickets chirping.

The President said during July that, You know what, I'll invite any Republican Member to come down to the White House and go through this bill line by line so they will understand what I'm trying to do. I said, Great, Mr. President. Fired a letter off. Made a call down to the White House. That was around the time of the famous beer summit that you might remember. I said, I don't drink beer, but I'll bring Diet Coke if that will help pass the time. But I would appreciate the opportunity of going through this bill line by line. Again, never heard a word. Did see something quoted indirectly in one of the newspapers on the Hill that the White House really was not interested in speaking with me on that subject.

The President then offered during that speech in the middle of September, the President said, I will sit down with anyone. It's interesting. The President will sit down with Ahmadinejad and Hugo Chavez without preconditions, but he's not sure about congressional Republicans. But that night at least he said, I'll sit down and meet and talk with congressional Republicans about this bill. Again, great many ideas to offer, Mr. President. I even produced a summary of the 50 amendments that I'd introduced in committee, many of the health care bills that I'd introduced during the course of this year, and said, Let's talk about some of these ideas down at the White House. Again, no answer back for that.

In October, kept trying to get information out of my committee chairman—the Subcommittee on Ways and Means—Mr. STARK, my subcommittee chairman, Mr. PALLONE. When can we see a bill? We're going to get this bill and we're going to take some time to read it and understand it. When can we see this bill?

Well, you'll have plenty of time. Don't worry about that. It will be coming along at some point. Maybe it's too complicated to read before we vote on it.

That bill left our committee July 31, in excess of a thousand pages. We went home to our August town halls during the summer and people didn't like a thousand-page bill changing their health care. They said, Members of Congress won't read it. You won't accept the insurance for yourself, so we don't want it either. A thousand-page bill upset people. That was actually a revelation for me during the summer. I thought the Republicans ought to have their own bill to counteract the Democratic bill, but, in fact, what people were telling me is, We'd like to see you do something specifically with pre-existing conditions. I'd like to see some specifics on increasing competition by being able to buy across State lines. We'd like to see something specific about holding down health care costs by offering some sensible liability reform, which we don't see in this bill. These were the things that the American people wanted us to see. Perhaps you might even argue that seven small bills might have been better than one large bill.

What happened next was after that bill left our committee at a thousand-plus pages, it went over to the Speaker's office, and then in secret, with the White House participating, no Republicans, and I submit no back-bench Democrats were involved in that process either, the bill comes out at the end of October, the first of November, and it's 2,000 pages. Well, if a thousand-page bill upset people some, a 2,000-page bill really upset them. As a consequence, we heard from our constituents. In my office, the phones were ringing off the hook day and night, calls almost uniformly against what-

ever was going to happen next in the House with the passage of this bill. As people learned more about the bill, they got more and more uncomfortable about it.

What occurred next was we passed this bill on the floor of the House late on a Saturday night after we'd been kept up here all week and all weekend to pass this bill. It passed by a slim, slim number of votes. In fact, just a few votes changing one way or the other and the bill would not have passed.

It was interesting that the Cable News Network, CNN, produced a poll the morning that we voted on the bill. And I don't remember the precise numbers, but it was approximately 26 percent of the American people liked the bill the way it was and wanted us to pass it just the way it was. A larger number, perhaps 35 percent, wanted major changes in the bill before it was passed. A similar number, about 25 percent, felt that Congress shouldn't even be doing this, that we were overstepping our authority by even working on health care. And then a smaller number was simply disinterested.

So you had 26 percent of the American people thought we were doing the right thing that day when we passed that bill. So it's no great surprise that after that bill passed that, again, many Members have heard from their constituents and, again, there's a great deal of angst and anxiety out there in the country over what has happened. But, undaunted, they picked it up in the Senate and let's go forward. Let's get this bill done. And you heard it discussed in the last hour.

I've told people now for several weeks what we're doing up here has really nothing to do with health care. When's the last time you heard anyone talk about a vaccination rate, or when's the last time you heard anyone talk about something to reduce hospital-acquired infections? No, we're not talking about that. We're talking about how many Medicaid dollars do we need to give away in Louisiana in order to secure a Senate vote. It's an arithmetic equation. The first one to 60 wins. And, as it turns out, the Senate majority leader and the Senate Democrats have 60 votes, and they were able to collar in every one of those and pass the bill right before they left on Christmas Eve. So Santa Claus may have put coal in the stocking of many Americans who were expecting something worthwhile to come out of the House and Senate this year, but he left the Senate floor on Christmas Eve and now is our first blush back in the Chambers to deal with the aftermath.

Now what has caused all the flap since then is normal process is the House passes a bill, Senate passes a bill. There's going to be differences. The House is a different structure than the Senate. The House has a 2-year term. There are more of us in the House. We tend to be a little more rough-and-tumble than the gentle-

manly arena over in the Senate, but that's the way the Founders designed it. So there's always likely to be some differences between the House and the Senate bill. That's not a problem.

The House and the Senate have a way of reconciling that. They get the two together and let's call a conference committee. Conferees are appointed by the Democrats in the House, the Republicans in the House, the Democrats in the Senate, Republicans in the Senate. The conference committee meets and works out the differences. It might pass on a party-line vote. Of course, there are more Democrats on the conference committee than Republicans but, hey, they won the election, and that's what elections are all about.

But the conference committee is not going to happen because—it's not going to happen because this debate now has become an internal debate on the Democratic Party. We will continue to be blamed on the Republican side for obstructing this bill, but please understand there is nothing that we can do. We lack the numbers to stop this bill—supermajority in the House, a 60-vote majority in the Senate. All the Republicans can stay together and the bill still passes because we just simply do not have the numbers.

The arguments that are going on right now are arguments entirely within the Democratic conference. And it is a conference committee, if you will, of the Democratic conference where they're trying to work out the difference the Democrats have with Democrats over the bill, and ignore the Republicans—blame them, to be sure, because they're useful to blame as being obstructionists, but realistically no Republican is obstructing or slowing down this bill. We can't. We would like to, but we can't.

Now, actually, there is perhaps something that might happen. We talked a little bit earlier about sometimes events that happen, change things here in the Chambers, events that happen out of the country. There is going to be a special Senate election in one of the States in the next week's time. In fact, a week from today there's going to be an election from the Senate. If that Senate seat were to change from Democrat to Republican, that would shift the balance from 60 Democrats to 59 Democrats. I'm sorry, 58 Democrats and two Independents that vote with the Democrats for a functional 60-vote majority in the Senate. But they could lose one of their votes. What happens then? Can we rush this bill through before that new Senator can be sworn in to stop things? I don't know. It will be interesting to see what the plans are, what people try to do. But that could be a game changer that no one would have anticipated a month ago as we left out of these Chambers, that a Senate seat that has historically been in Democratic hands for years and years and years could possibly change.

But such is the angst of the American people over what they've seen us

do. And because we've done so much of it, so much of it in secret in the Speaker's suite of offices, again, with the heavy hand of the White House applied at all times; the Majority leader's office over in the Senate, with the heavy hand of the White House applied at all times, why shouldn't—okay, fine, lock the Republicans out.

□ 2130

We lost the election. Maybe we deserved to be locked out, but don't lock the American people out. Which kind of brings us back to the issue of C-SPAN and Brian Lamb's letter to the President. We have all heard. We saw on the news shows a couple days ago. We saw the multiple clips that were up on various Web sites of the President during the campaign saying over and over, I want this process to be open. I want the ideas to be brought in. I just ask that we do this out in the open, around a big table. Bring the C-SPAN cameras in so all can see. If your Member of Congress would rather stand with the special interests than stand with the American people, I want you to see that.

Mr. President, I think you got it right. I want to see that. That's the reason I filed the resolution of inquiry. Because if a Member of Congress is going to stand with a special interest—and not all special interests are Republican special interests, bear in mind. Some of them may be a union special interest on the Democratic side. We heard another discussion tonight by the AARP. Who knows where the special interests are? The American people know, and the American people need to be able to watch that and make those decisions for themselves. This is a big deal.

The first President Bush, during the campaign for President, famously said that the Democrats are going to come to me with tears in their eyes and say, Raise our taxes. And he said that I'll turn to them and say, read my lips, no new taxes. And then he walked back from that pledge, and it cost him. It cost him in the next election. It cost a lot of credibility on the Republican side for a President to walk back on that pledge. So if you have a President who said that this is going to be such an open and aboveboard process that I'll put the cameras in the room, you'll be able to see which Members of Congress are aligning with the American people and which Members of Congress are aligning with the special interests, who's taking up for the insurance companies, who's taking up for the drug companies, who's taking up for the unions, who's taking up for this special interest group or that special interest group? You will be able to see that on C-SPAN, and the President has now walked back from that pledge. In fact, his press secretary wouldn't even openly acknowledge that they were walking back from that pledge.

Well, let's stop and think for a minute. What is the symbolism of C-

SPAN to the American people? People are watching tonight on C-SPAN. C-SPAN is like a window into Congress. It's impartial. It doesn't have an editorial objective. It doesn't come with an agenda. Sometimes it can be frighteningly boring, but at the same time, it is what the American people have identified as their way to keep an eye on Congress. My predecessor, the former House Majority Leader Dick Armey, when he was deciding to run for Congress that first time back in 1983 or 1984, said that he watched the proceedings on C-SPAN, and it troubled him, and he thought he could do better.

You know what? The same thing applies to me. I watched C-SPAN from labor and delivery on the little television that the hospital provided. And I would see things happen, like the House vote on an increased expansion of the debt limit, and I would get frustrated and upset. C-SPAN has been a way to invite the American people back into the people's House, and that has been an important aspect of what has happened with C-SPAN. But think back for just a minute. Why did C-SPAN happen? It wasn't just something that got created on the eighth day because they were running out of things to do. C-SPAN happened because of Watergate. C-SPAN happened because the Watergate hearings that were held were covered by 24-hour continuous, live television coverage.

Television executives said, Nobody is going to watch that stuff. That's so boring, no one's going to watch that. It's like watching your grass grow, watching your grass die in wintertime. But people watched, and they were fascinated by the process. As a consequence, the C-SPAN cameras then came on, and they have not been turned off from Watergate until this day. And the American people get that. C-SPAN is synonymous with good government and good governance.

So if you're not proud enough of your work to put it up there on C-SPAN, what have you got to hide? Why have we developed the major House legislation completely in secret? Why have we developed the major Senate legislation—which now, by the way, is up to 2,700 pages. Why have we developed that completely in secret? I say the White House was involved. We all know that people from the White House were here in the Capitol building the days that those bills were worked on. But since we couldn't watch it on C-SPAN, we don't know who from the White House was sitting in, what they were saying, whether they were simply standing there with their arms folded, or were they participating? Were they part of the give-and-take, Hey, if do you this, we'll do this. We'll try to help you with this. We'll try to protect you here.

We don't know because none of that, none of that has been available to the American people. But the American people do get this. C-SPAN is good gov-

ernment. C-SPAN is good governance. C-SPAN is sunshine on the process. Sure, there's a value in opacity. Anyone can tell you that. But if you're able to kind of get, you know, some of the guys together in secret and kind of work things out amongst yourselves, and then you come to the House floor and say, Well, here's what we think the American people want. No, it's what these guys decide by themselves behind closed doors. Nobody wants that. Republicans lost the majority because the then minority leader NANCY PELOSI said that the Republicans were crafting bills in secret with the special interest groups, writing the legislation.

Well, guess what, folks: Nothing's changed. It's just different special interest groups today than perhaps there were 5, 6 or 7 years ago. The way to ensure that this process is fair and above board is to keep the cameras on, not to include the Republicans in the room. I think we should be in the room, by the way. But that's not necessarily the key to the transparency. The key is to let the American people in the room if they choose to do so. If they're uninterested, if there are other things going on, if there are football playoffs, Final Four, beauty pageants, and the American people are not interested and don't want to watch the goings-on on C-SPAN, so be it. They had the opportunity. They chose to do other things. No one to blame but themselves if they don't like the final product.

But at least they had the option of turning on that channel and watching the proceedings. Our committee hearings, our committee markup was covered on C-SPAN hour after hour after hour, and many of us would sit there and write in little Twitter messages about what was going on now in the committee process. And the three people who are interested in what I send out on a Twitter feed were grateful to get that little bit of information, that little kernel of information. Then they go turn on C-SPAN and say, Yeah, sure enough they're talking about community organizers in health clinics now.

Well, the American people ought to have that option, and the fact that they don't, the fact that we will not give it to them then raises the question in their minds, What do we have to hide? You've got a big bill, now 2,700 pages. We don't think you're reading it. We don't think you'll take the insurance that it produces for yourself, for your families. Why should we be satisfied about what you're doing to—we heard it quoted earlier—one-sixth of the American economy? Why should we be satisfied that you're going to change the health care arrangement that 85 percent of the country says they are either satisfied or very satisfied with? Why are we going to change that arrangement simply to bestow additional political power on a select group of Members of Congress and Senators?

Because remember, this bill has nothing to do with health care any longer. If you don't believe me, watch—

oh, you can't watch, that's right. But remember what happened over on the Senate side. This wasn't about how do we improve outcomes. This was, how do we get the outcome we want, which is to pass this bill? There is something wrong with the process when you say, We can't let you read it. We can't wait. We've got to do it in a hurry. And oh, by the way, the benefits that are going to come to you off of this bill actually start in 2014. Your taxes will start next week.

The American people get that. That's a problem. It's a 2,700-page bill—or at least the one that they passed on the Senate floor was. Goodness knows what it will look like. Whatever happens to it, it's going to be a big bill. There is going to be a lot of legislative language. Well, what happens to legislative language after the bill becomes law? The President signs it down at the White House, a big signing ceremony. People from all over gathered around him, a great day is had by all, a wonderful photo op. What happens then to this signed piece of legislation, this public law that has now been created through this very flawed process?

Well, it goes over to the Federal agency, the Department of Health and Human Services. And there the rules and regulations are written that will dictate what happens in health care to everyone in the country. Those rules will be written, and they'll be written in secret as well. To be sure, there will be a notice of proposed rulemaking. There will be thousands and thousands and thousands of pages generated in the Federal Register of this notice of proposed rulemaking and the rules and regulations that come out of this 2,700 page bill. I would submit that those rules and regulations will probably number in the tens of thousands of pages once it gets through the goings-on over at Health and Human Services.

But here is something that's kind of strange about all of that. One of the big arbiters of those decisions is an individual who is in charge of a part of the agency of Health and Human Services, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. CMS we call it. CMS has an administrator. The administrator at CMS is going to be the one in charge of writing a lot of those rules and regulations.

Well, now, who is the administrator at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services? Let's stop and think for a minute. Well, there isn't one because a year into this administration, no name has been put forward to the Senate for confirmation for the administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. And yet we're in a rush to get this bill passed. We've got to get this thing done. Time's a wasting. People are hurting. We're going to pass this legislation. It's going to go over there to an empty auditorium until that position is filled. It's not the Senate that is blocking a Presidential nomination. Don't fall for that. There has been no name put forward in a year's time.

Now, do you think there's going to be a fight over that nomination over in the Senate? Yeah. I'll bet there is because that individual is going to hold a tremendous amount of power with a 2,700-page bill that affects every jot and tittle of how medicine is practiced in this country. Yeah. There is going to be a pretty big fight over in the Senate, and there should be because it is going to be a very, very powerful position.

So we certainly don't want to rush someone through like we've seen with some of the other Federal agency heads in this past year and have someone in that job who doesn't fit the bill. We want someone who is competent. We want somebody maybe who has run an integrated delivery system at some point along the line. We want someone who has some experience in dealing with not just the creation of health care policy but the actual delivery side, putting the meat on the bones, if I can use that analogy, someone who has actually worked in the trenches in health care.

I think that would be an enormously important first step. But again, we don't even know who that individual is at this point. Since the acting administrator left at the end of the Bush administration, it has basically been filled by agency personnel who are career bureaucrats, and their ability to deal with a 2,700-page bill is anyone's guess. I'm not being critical of the Department of Health and Human Services. That's just the way it is. Right now you've got people who are acting in that capacity, but they are not direct Presidential appointees.

So there is not that accountability. There has not been advice and consent from the Senate, as is required under the Constitution for a Presidential appointment. This is not a czar, after all. This is an actual administrator of one of the agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services. So there are a lot of moving parts yet to happen.

Now we've seen this bill have more than its share of near-death experiences. Maybe it would be the best thing if one of those near-death experiences actually stuck and forced us to go back and craft something that would actually be useful for the American people. Now I'm not talking about delaying. Remember, it's 2014 before any of these good and great and wonderful programs are going to come to a town near you. There is no urgency about implementing any of the great things that have been talked about in conjunction with this bill. They are going to languish by the wayside.

So since we have that gift of time, why not try to get it right? Because I will tell you this: I've heard people say, Well, let them pass their bill, and then perhaps the Republicans can fix it and repeal the parts they don't like. No, it doesn't work like that. It doesn't work like that. Once you start collecting taxes from people for a yet-to-be re-

ceived benefit at some point in the future, it becomes very, very difficult to roll that back.

We have a lot of discussion in this House of Representatives about what are the right things to do with Medicare in the future. And goodness knows that any one of us might do things a little bit differently in setting up the Medicare system if we could roll the clock back to 1965 and start over, but we can't. We have what we have with that program. And it becomes—as you've heard over and over again on the floor of this House—it becomes very, very difficult then to take big chunks of it away. We are going to take \$500 billion out of Medicare. That's going to hurt some people.

□ 2145

It is not going to be without pain for some people to do that. There are going to be constituencies that are benefited, and some that are upset. Such is the nature of doing those types of things. Well, you can just imagine if you have the whole health care bill and now you are trying to do that kind of major surgery on that bill after the fact, it is going to be very, very painful, indeed.

So I would submit that as many near-death experiences that this bill has had and as many times as it has been resuscitated literally off the floor of the House and brought back to life, perhaps we would all be better off if one of these times this bill did not survive, and we went back and tried to do the right thing. Again, I enumerated those a moment ago.

What I heard repetitively in the town halls I did this summer and this fall: we are scared of what you are doing. We don't think that you are competent to do the things you have said you are going to do, but we would like to see something done about people who, through no fault of their own, lose employer-sponsored insurance, have had a tough medical diagnosis and now find that they are frozen out of the insurance market, they are on the outside looking in, and it becomes very difficult for them to get back into a condition of insurance.

We would like to see some of the protections that are out there for the ERISA-administered plans, we would like to see those out in the individual market. And we would like to see more flexibility for COBRA plans, for people who lose their job and then lose their employer-sponsored insurance; and, oh, under COBRA, you can keep it for 18 months but you have to pay not just your premium but the two-thirds that the employer was kicking in during the time of your employment. And guess what, you have just lost your job so that is a very difficult payment to maintain. I know, I saw patients with this when I was in practice.

But we could do things to allow more flexibility within the COBRA plan so that it didn't have to be an identical insurance plan that person carried under COBRA. It could be a plan that

had perhaps a benefits package that was more in keeping with what that person could afford at that time. But we don't know; we have never had that discussion. We have never had a hearing or a discussion on that. We have never had an opportunity to have a give and take between the right and the left over what that might look like.

Preexisting conditions, we talk about things like risk pools and reinsurance. Maybe there is a way to do that. The CBO scored one proposal that cost \$25 billion over 10 years. Well, that is expensive; but it is a whole lot less than \$1 trillion. If that is the main problem the American people want to see fixed, why not work on that. Perhaps there is some place we can get that \$25 billion without adding to the deficit. Maybe that would be a legitimate use for some of the moneys in the Medicare slush fund, but we don't know because we never tried. We never had the hearing, and we never seriously addressed how do we do anything other than take it all over, which is what we have done with this bill.

Liability, the Congressional Budget Office has said there is \$50 billion of savings over 10 years or more. Some people say that is a drop in the bucket with health care costs. Maybe so, but it is a start. And it is a pretty big drop, and it is one that we can ill afford to just ignore. Why don't we have those discussions, and why don't we have those hearings. Why don't we do the right thing for the American people and not just continue to protect a special interest group who may have a significant interest in keeping the liability laws the way that they are.

We have had some big changes down in Texas, and it has improved things for people. It has brought more practicing physicians into the State. It gets a lot of criticism because prices and costs have not come down, but that does take time. A journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step, and you have got to take that first step, which is liability reform, before you are ever going to get any of those other benefits. But, indeed, costs have come down. The cost of insurance has come down. The number of doctors available for delivering the care has increased, and we all know the laws of supply and demand: if you increase the number of doctors in a community, costs will diminish. People will have more open appointment slots, and they are anxious to fill them. If there is excess capacity to fill in their clinics, they are going to want to fill those appointment slots. So perhaps they are willing to take someone who will pay over time, or perhaps they will offer a discount to get more people in. That's the way things work.

Instead, we have this massive government overlay that is going to control every aspect of your doctor's and patient's life, and it has never been tested. We have a system that 85 percent of the American people are satisfied or

very satisfied, and we are going to change it all with something no one has ever seen in this country. God help us if they don't like it. Well, we know that they don't like it because they have told us they don't like it. A CNN poll, CNN which generally tends to be very favorable to programs proposed by this President, generally tends to be very favorable to Big Government solutions to social problems, 26 percent of the people polled by CNN said, hey Congress, we like what you are doing, go get them. The other 75 percent said slow down and do things differently or you shouldn't even be working on it at all, or we don't know what you are doing and we don't care. But only 26 percent endorsed the activities of this House of Representatives. And that is consistent with the numbers that you see even tonight that are reported by the various reporting agencies, Web sites and cable news services who report around 55 to 58 percent of the American people don't like what they see us doing with health care.

That brings me back to the resolution of inquiry which was filed on December 17. A resolution of inquiry is a tool that the minority has or in fact a Member on the majority has in order to ask for information that they believe is being withheld from them that they need in order to make an informed legislative resolution. It is H. Res. 983, introduced on December 17 just as we left town for the Christmas break. It requires 14 legislative days to mature at which time it must be either voted on in committee or discharged from the committee to the House floor where it becomes then what is called a privileged resolution to ask that that information be delivered.

Now, I know we don't have the numbers to pass anything on the Republican side. I know a resolution of inquiry introduced in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, if the chairman wants to simply quash it, he has the votes to do that. He will ask his side to vote with him on voting "no" on the resolution of inquiry, and that's where it stays.

But I was encouraged by a newspaper article that appeared on the day that the resolution was filed. It appeared in one of the newspapers up here in Washington called *The Hill*, and in it Chairman WAXMAN was quoted as saying, and remember this resolution of inquiry was requesting documents from the White House that were produced in meetings last May and June when the White House invited six parties to participate in talks down at the White House.

They came up with \$2 trillion in savings over 10 years that they were going to then use to pay for this health care bill. Those were representatives of the pharmaceutical industry, the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, an association of American insurance plans, the medical device manufacturers, and the Service Employees International Union. So you

had a rather disparate group of individuals representing doctors, insurers, hospitals, medical device manufacturers, pharmaceutical manufacturers, and union representatives who each brought something to the table to say we can give you this much in savings if you will help us with whatever if there is a problem. We don't know what was offered up by the groups that were meeting at the White House, and we don't know what was offered back by the people in attendance at the White House.

Chairman WAXMAN was quoted as saying: If there are such documents, BURGESS should get them, but I don't know if there are such documents. I think some of these things that he wants are not written down, and different people have different ideas of what was agreed.

Well, fair enough. Maybe there wasn't anything written down. It is a little hard for me to believe that a \$2 trillion agreement would be reached on nothing more than a handshake. But if indeed that is the way it went down, then someone should at least tell me.

I sent a letter to the White House September 30 talking about this very issue and asking for specifics as they came out of those meetings and as yet have gotten no answer from the White House. If the answer is, we have no documents, that there never were any documents produced, we did all of this \$2 trillion of savings simply on a wink and a nod and a handshake, fine, just tell me that.

But at the present time, you are left with situations as developed in the Senate Finance Committee when a tax was suggested on some of the hospital charges and the hospital association said, wait, that wasn't part of our deal. Well, if that wasn't part of the deal, what was the deal? Can you give us some of the details on what was agreed to? Again, as legislators trying to write this legislation so it won't conflict with anything that has been agreed to by the White House, it seems it would make good common sense that they would want to share that with us. I frankly don't understand why that information has not been forthcoming.

Now this resolution was introduced on December 17. Sometime likely toward the end of the first week of February or at the beginning of the second week in February, it will have to come to a vote in the committee. We will see what they do with it. Again, the chairman may say, look, nice try, but we are not interested in pursuing that right now and vote it down; or it may come to the floor as a privileged resolution.

But at least over that period of time we have the opportunity to talk about this. We have the opportunity to talk about these secret deals that were struck down at the White House, and then it ties in very much with the story that everything is going to be up and out in the open on C-SPAN, but we don't want to let the C-SPAN cameras

in the room while we craft this final legislative product that is going to deal with health care and how health care is administered in this country for the next two or three generations. That is pretty important, but we are not going to get to see any part of what is going on.

The American people understand that C-SPAN is sunshine. C-SPAN represents good government. C-SPAN was the foil that the American people had against the excesses of a Presidential administration that overstepped its bounds and brought us the spectacle of Watergate and the crumbling of a Presidency. C-SPAN is the preventive medicine that keeps that from happening again in the future.

The first President Bush went back on a pledge he made in the campaign. He made it one time, and he was dealt with very severely by the American people and did not win a second term as President. And many people feel that going back on that pledge of no new taxes, and it wasn't so much the fact that he raised taxes, it was that he raised taxes after he told us he wouldn't. Now we have a President who said it will be out in the open, trust me. You will be able to see it. If your Member of Congress is standing with the insurance companies instead of you, you will know that. Well, guess what, now you don't.

I will tell you since there are no Republicans in the room, there are no Republicans standing with the special interests as this health care bill is being written because we are not allowed in the room and we are not allowed to be part of the process. But we don't know what Democrats are defending the insurance companies or the unions. We don't know what Democrats are defending the pharmaceutical manufacturers. And we don't know what Democrats are defending the doctors, if indeed any actually are. We don't know because we are shut out of the process. Not just us as Republicans, but us as the American people. And that is what is so inflammatory about what has happened this past week here in Washington, D.C.

□ 2200

So a lot has occurred since the House and the Senate went out just before Christmas. We are now back in town. We are told we have an artificial time frame of doing this before the State of the Union address, though it appears that the State of the Union address is a little bit fluid because we don't want to schedule it on top of the season's start of a new television series, so some give-and-take about when that actual address is to be scheduled. I thought it was the end of January. It's now sometime in February.

We do have a big Senate election, and people would do wise to tune into that and be aware of what is happening in a part of this country where a Senate seat that has been safely in Democratic hands for two or three generations may

in fact change hands a week from tonight. How long will it take to get that new Senator sworn in? How long will it take to get that new Senator to town so they will be able to vote on this very important health care legislation? Will it take longer if that is no longer a reliable "yes" vote but becomes a problematic "no" vote? Will there be an attempt to run out the clock or stretch out the clock so that we don't seat that new Senator? I think the American people need to pay attention to that because all of those things are an integral part of this process that we call "health care reform" that is now playing out in its final chapter here on the floor of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, you've been very generous with the time, and I'm going to yield back the balance of my time.

SEPTEMBER 30, 2009.

PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT, I write you once again on the topic of health care reform. As you know, Democrat leaders in the House of Representatives are currently working to merge the three committee bills. Meanwhile, the two Senate bills are waiting to be merged pending completion of the Senate Finance Committee's mark-up of the Baucus plan.

I have closely followed the health care debate for months, making note of actions by all parties involved, including the House, Senate, White House, advocate groups, and the health care industry. These reforms have wide-reaching implications, and you have stressed the importance of conducting business in public so that the American people are aware and involved in the process.

In fact, during a Democratic Presidential primary debate on January 31, 2008, you said: "That's what I will do in bringing all parties together, not negotiating behind closed doors, but bringing all parties together, and broadcasting those negotiations on C-SPAN so that the American people can see what the choices are, because part of what we have to do is enlist the American people in this process."

It has now been over four months since the White House announced numerous deals with major stakeholders in the health care debate to save upwards of \$2 trillion in the health care system. Little to no details regarding the negotiations have been released, and recent actions and press reports have reminded me of the importance of openness and transparency throughout the legislative process.

Roll Call reports today that negotiators working in the House to merge the three committee bills plan to trim the cost of the legislation by roughly \$200 billion. I wonder what programs or services are being cut, who will be affected, and how these cuts are being decided.

In the Senate Finance Committee's mark-up, Senator Bill Nelson (D-Fla.) introduced an amendment regarding drug prices in Medicare and Medicaid. During the debate on the amendment, Senator Tom Carper (D-Del.), while arguing against the amendment, said "Whether you like PhRMA or not, we have a deal," referring to the deal PhRMA cut with the White House earlier this year.

In addition, within the Senate Finance Committee plan is a commission to slow the growth of Medicare spending, most likely through changes to reimbursement policy. However, hospitals would be exempt from this commission because, according to CongressDaily, "they already negotiated a

cost cutting agreement" with the White House.

Despite your promise to make all health care reform negotiations in public, we still have very few details on what exactly was agreed to during these highly publicized negotiations. In fact, even the stakeholders involved have, at times, seemed at odds with what was actually agreed to. But the one thing we all know is that, through press statements, many deals were made. Unfortunately, even where brief descriptions of policy goals are available, details on achieving these goals are absent, a point made by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO).

I am compelled to ask—how could Congress have done its' due diligence in creating the policy before us without crucial details surrounding these deals? Were the votes we have seen in the Senate Finance Committee as of late a direct result of these backroom negotiations? Will CBO be able to actually score any of these deals to apply those cost savings to legislation? Were these negotiations in the best interests of patients?

Having little to no information, I cannot judge. However, this begs even more questions. Is Congress enacting the best policy reforms for Americans, or are certain changes being made or not made because of the negotiations orchestrated by the White House? Will smaller stakeholders suffer more from our policy choices because of what larger groups may have negotiated behind closed doors?

Mr. President, I do not write this letter to chide you for engaging in what I consider the most pressing debate before Congress. I applaud you for your leadership in compelling Congress to act. In order to fully understand the policy choices before us, though, we need to know what took place earlier this year during these meetings at the White House. You have made it very clear that you value transparency and have sought to make your Administration stand out in this regard. As a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee's subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, so do I. The last thing I would want to see is a formal investigation of these meetings.

Thus, I formally request full disclosure by the White House in the following areas regarding all meetings with health care stakeholders occurring earlier this year on the topic of securing an agreement on health reform legislation, efforts to pay for any such legislation, and undertakings to bend the out year cost curve:

1. A list of all agreements entered into, in writing or in principle, between any and all individuals associated with the White House and any and all individuals, groups, associations, companies or entities who are stakeholders in health care reform, as well as the nature, sum and substance of the agreements; and,

2. The name of any and all individuals associated with the White House who participated in the decision-making process during these negotiations, and the names, dates and titles of meetings they participated in regarding negotiations with the aforementioned entities in question one; and,

3. The names of any and all individuals, groups, associations, companies or entities who requested a meeting with the White House regarding health care reform who were denied a meeting.

In our efforts to improve access to health care services, the American people expect us to act in their best interests, rather than protecting business interests of those who are interested in currying favor in Washington, DC. If these health related stakeholders have made concessions to Washington politicians without asking anything in exchange for the patients they serve, Congress and, most importantly, the American

public deserve to know. Conversely, if they sought out protections for industry-specific policies, we need to know that as well.

We must learn what these negotiations mean for the millions of concerned Americans. How they will be better served, including having affordable health coverage and access to the providers they need? These negotiations may have produced consensus on policy changes that are proper and needed, but Congress will never know for sure that we are acting in our constituents' best interests until all the facts are known.

I look forward to the opportunity to speak with you at your earliest convenience on this matter. Should your staff have any questions about this request please contact me or my Legislative Director J.P. Paluskiewicz at my Washington, D.C. office at 202-225-7772.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL C. BURGESS, M.D.,
Member of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and January 13.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the

balance of the week on account of official business.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and through January 27.

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONAWAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, January 13 and 19.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today and January 13 and 19.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and January 13.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, January 13.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today and January 13 and 19.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 13, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the third quarter and fourth quarter of 2009 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NORTHERN IRELAND AND SCOTLAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 8 AND NOV. 18, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Tanner	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		849.60						9,334.80
	11/11	11/18	Scotland		3,229.80		³ 5,255.40				
Hon. John Boozman	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,175.16		(³)				3,623.81
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,068.24		(³)				3,516.89
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Hon. Baron Hill	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,175.16		(³)				3,623.81
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Hon. Carolyn McCarthy	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		961.32		(³)				3,409.97
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Hon. Jeff Miller	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,175.16		(³)				3,623.81
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Hon. Dennis Moore	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,175.16		(³)				3,623.81
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Hon. Mike Ross	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,175.16		(³)				3,623.81
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Hon. David Scott	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,175.16		(³)				3,623.81
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Hon. John Shimkus	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,232.00		³ 3,968.10				6,200.10
Hon. Albio Sires	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,175.16		(³)				3,623.81
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Hon. John Turner	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,175.16		(³)				3,623.81
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,448.65						
Melissa Adamson	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		876.33						9,361.53
	11/11	11/18	Scotland		3,229.80		³ 5,255.40				
Kathy Becker	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,112.67		³ 4,971.10				8,428.27
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,344.50						
Gene Gurevich	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,112.67		9,696.50				13,153.67
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,344.50						
Vincent Morelli	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,232.00		10,808.80				13,040.80
Dr. Amanda Sloat	11/8	11/11	Northern Ireland		1,112.67		9,696.50				13,153.67
	11/11	11/16	Scotland		2,344.50						
Delegation Expenses:											
Representational Funds									22,078.66		22,078.66
Miscellaneous									458.44		458.44
Committee total					58,938.38		49,651.80		22,537.10		131,127.28

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5199. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0038; FV09-922-1FIR] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5200. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pistachios Grown in California; Changes to Handling Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0031; FV09-983-1FR] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5201. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Walnuts Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate and Changes to Regulations Governing Reporting and Recordkeeping [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0020; FV09-984-3FR] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5202. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0063; FV09-966-2IFR] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5203. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, CA; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0045; FV09-987-2FR] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5204. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Onions Grown in South Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0044; FV09-959-2FIR] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5205. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pistachios Grown in California; Order Amending Marketing Order No. 983 [Doc. No.: AO-FV-08-0147; AMS-FV-08-0051; FV08-983-1] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5206. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, CA; Changes to Nomination Procedures and a Reporting Date [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0035; FV09-987-1FR] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5207. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Basic Provisions (RIN: 0563-AC23) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5208. A letter from the Regulatory Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Poultry Contracts; Initiation, Performance, and Termination (RIN: 0580-AA98) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5209. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agri-

culture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Dairy Economic Loss Assistance Payment Program (RIN: 0560-A107) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5210. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenpyroximate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0556; FRL-8799-2] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5211. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0330; FRL-8799-9] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5212. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cold Pressed Neem Oil; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-1025; FRL-8434-5] received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5213. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the "Annual Report on the Department of Defense Mentor-Protégé Program" for FY 2007 and 2008, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 831; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5214. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's Buy American Report pursuant to Title VIII, Subtitle C, Section 8306, of the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-28), pursuant to Public Law 110-28; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5215. A letter from the Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance; Capital — Residential Mortgage Loans Modified Pursuant to the Home Affordable Mortgage Program [Docket No.: R-1361] received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5216. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Financial Stability, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's summary of the actions taken in response to the recommendations issued in the Government Accountability Office eighth major report on the Troubled Asset Relief Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5217. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance; Capital-Residential Mortgage Loans Modified Pursuant to the Home Affordable Mortgage Program [Docket ID: OCC-2009-0018] (RIN: 1557-AD25) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5218. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Model Privacy Form Under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act [Release Nos. 34-61003, IA-2950, IC-28997; File No. S7-09-07] (RIN: 3235-AJO6) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5219. A letter from the Legal Information Assistant, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance; Cap-

ital-Residential Mortgage Loans Modified Pursuant to the Home Affordable Mortgage Program [No. OTS-2009-0020] (RIN: 1550-AC34) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5220. A letter from the Legal Information Assistant, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Model Privacy Form Under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act [Docket ID: OTS-2009-0014] (RIN: 1550-AC12) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5221. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Hong Kong pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5222. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Defining Safe Harbor Protection for Treatment by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as Conservator or Receiver of Financial Assets Transferred by an Insured Depository Institution in Connection With a Securitization or Participation (RIN: 3064-AD53) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5223. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Transactions Between Member Banks and Their Affiliates: Exemption for Certain Securities Financing Transactions Between a Member Bank and an Affiliate [Regulation W; Docket No. R-1330] December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5224. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Leverage Capital Guidelines [Regulations H and Y; Docket No. 1332] received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5225. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Transactions Between Member Banks and Their Affiliates: Exemption for Certain Purchases of Asset-Backed Commercial Paper by a Member Bank from an Affiliate [Regulation W; Docket No. R-1331] received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5226. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Proxy Disclosure Enhancements [Release Nos. 33-9089; 34-61175; IC-29092; File No. S7-13-09] (RIN: 3235-AK28) received December 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5227. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Custody of Funds or Securities of Clients by Investment Advisers [Release No.: IA-2968; File No. S7-09-09] (RIN: 3235-AK32) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5228. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions; Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education

(TEACH) Grant Program; Federal Pell Grant Program; Academic Competitiveness Grant Program and National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent Grant Program [Docket ID: ED-2009-OPE-0001] (RIN: 1840-AC96) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5229. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Institutions and Lender Requirements Relating to Education Loans, Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, and William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program (RIN: 1840-AC95) received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5230. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Service, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program [Docket ID: ED-2009-OESE-0007] (RIN: 1810-AB04) received December 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5231. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting report entitled "Report to Congress on the Provision of Services to Head Start Children with Disabilities" program year 2007-2008; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5232. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5233. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Applications for Food and Drug Administration Approval to Market a New Drug; Postmarketing Reports; Reporting Information About Authorized Generic Drugs [Docket No. FDA-2008-N-0341] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5234. A letter from the Staff Assistant, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule of Fees Authorized by 49 U.S.C. 30141 Offer of Cash Deposits or Obligations of the United States in Lieu of Sureties on DOT Conformance Bonds [Docket No.: NHTSA-2007-0037; Notice 2] (RIN: 2127-AK10) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5235. A letter from the Staff Assistant, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Safety Standards, Child Restraint Systems [Docket No.: 08-0137] (RIN: 2127-AK36) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5236. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Determination of Attainment of the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0188; FRL-9086-7] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5237. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Min-

nesota [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1130; FRL-9087-7] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5238. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Source-Specific Revision for Avis Rent-A-Car and Budget Rent-A-Car Facilities Located at the Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0023; FRL-9086-1] received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5239. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Change of Address for Region 4 State and Local Agencies; Technical Correction [FRL-8973-6] received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5240. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky: NO_x SIP Call Phase II [EPA-R04-OAR-2005-KY-0003; FRL-8972-2] received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5241. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revision to Clean Air Interstate Rule Sulfur Dioxide Trading Program [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0599; FRL-8971-4] received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5242. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations, (Fort Myers, Florida) [MB Docket No.: 09-170] received December 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5243. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations, (Traverse City, Michigan) [MB Docket No.: 09-160] received October 20, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5244. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations, (St. Petersburg, Florida) [MB Docket No.: 09-159] received October 20, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5245. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities [Docket No.: RM05-5-013; Order No. 676-E] received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5246. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's fifth annual report on Ethanol Market Concentration, pursuant to Section 1501(a)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5247. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Com-

mission's Report to Congress on Marketing Violent Entertainment to Children: A Sixth Follow-up Review of Industry Practices In the Motion Picture, Music Recording & Electronic Game Industries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5248. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5249. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Administrative Changes: Clarification of the Location of Guidance for Electronic Submission and other Miscellaneous Corrections [NRC-2009-0397] (RIN: 3150-AI73) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5250. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 09-70); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5251. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to section 36(b)(5)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No. 0B-09, relating to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 08-102 of 26 September 2008; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5252. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 119-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5253. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 130-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5254. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 146-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5255. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 092-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5256. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 133-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5257. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 137-09, certification of a proposed

technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5258. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 149-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5259. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 150-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5260. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment to the Kingdom of Jordan (Transmittal No. RSAT 09-1869); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5261. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment from the Kingdom of the Netherlands (Transmittal No. RSAT 09-1865); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5262. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 143-09, certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5263. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 154-09, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5264. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 155-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5265. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 134-09, certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad, and the export of firearms abroad, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5266. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 148-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 157-09, certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, to include technical data, and defense services, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5268. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 145-09 Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5269. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 144-09, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5270. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5271. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's formal response to a GAO report entitled "Democracy Assistance: U.S. Agencies Takes Steps to Coordinate International Programs but Lack Information on Some U.S.-funded Activities" (GAO-09-993); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5272. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's formal response to a GAO report entitled "International Food Assistance: USAID Is Taking Actions to Improve Monitoring and Evaluations of Nonemergency Food Aid, but Weaknesses in Planning Could Impede Efforts" (GAO-09-980); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5273. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's formal response to the GAO report entitled "Rebuilding IRAQ: Improved Management Controls and Iraqi Commitment Needed for Key State and USAID Capacity-Building Programs" (GAO-09-526); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5274. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report to Congress for the reporting period ending September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5275. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the semiannual report from the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5276. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5277. A letter from the General Counsel, Corporation for National & Community Service, transmitting Notice indicating that the Chief Financial Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service is no longer a position requiring nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5278. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5279. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's FY 2009 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5280. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the forty-first Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-Up, covering the six month period ending September 30, 2009 in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5281. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5282. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's FY 2009 Annual Report on Performance and Accountability; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5283. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's semiannual reports from the Office of the Treasury Inspector General and the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5284. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5285. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5286. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5287. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration, Executive Office of the President, transmitting accounting expenditures from the Unanticipated Needs Account for fiscal year 2009, pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 108; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5288. A letter from the Director, Human Resources Management Division, Executive Office of the President, Office of Administration, transmitting annual report on the use of the category rating system and selection process within the Office of the United States Trade Representative; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5289. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General of the Farm Credit Administration for the period April 1, 2009 through September

30, 2009; and the semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5290. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5291. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5292. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a semiannual report on Office of Inspector General auditing activity, together with a report providing management's perspective on the implementation status of audit recommendations for the period April 1, 2009 to September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5293. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5294. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report entitled "As Supervisors Retire: An Opportunity to Reshape Organizations", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5295. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5296. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period April 1, 2009 through September 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5297. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2009, as required by OMB Circular Number A-11; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5298. A letter from the Director of Administration, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5299. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's report on the actions taken to ensure that audits are conducted of its programs and operations for fiscal year 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5300. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting fiscal year 2009 Federal Information Security Management Act Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5301. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Of-

fice's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period April 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5302. A letter from the Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, transmitting the Semiannual Management Report to Congress for April 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009 and the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5303. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a separate management report for the period April 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5304. A letter from the General Counsel, Selective Service System, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5305. A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5306. A letter from the Administrator, United States Agency for International Development, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5307. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-255, "Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Support Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5308. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-138, "Initiative Measure No. 59, Legalization of Marijuana for Medical Treatment Initiative of 1999"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5309. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-244, "F Street, N.W., Downtown Retail Priority Area Clarification Amendment Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5310. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-243, "Waterfront Park at the Yards Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5311. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-248, "Religious Freedom and Civil Marriage Equality Amendment Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5312. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-246, "Income Tax Joint Filing Clarification Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5313. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-247, "Cooperative Housing Association Economic Interest Recordation Tax Temporary Amendment Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5314. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-245, "Affordable Housing For-Sale and Rental Distribution Amendment Act of 2009"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5315. A letter from the Chair, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Debt Collection received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

5316. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Final rules and transmittal of regulations to Congress [Notice 2009-271] received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

5317. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for fiscal year 2008 and a request for consideration in filling vacancies of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

5318. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the 2008 Annual Report for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 1211(f), 1267(g), and 1295; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5319. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Oil and Gas Leasing; National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska [WO-310-1310-PP-241A] (RIN: 1004-AD78) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5320. A letter from the Director, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report entitled, "Report to Congress: Minerals Management Service Royalty in Kind Operation Program" for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to Section 342 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5321. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Utah Regulatory Program [STATS No. UT-046-FOR; Docket ID No. OSM-2009-0005] received December 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5322. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Designation of Critical Habitat for *Cirsium ioncholepis* (La Graciosa Thistle) [FWS-R8-ES-2008-0078] (RIN: 1018-AV03) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5323. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's biennial report on the use of federal assistance provided to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission covering FY 2007 and FY 2008, pursuant to Section 811(c)(2) of the Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5324. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch by Vessels in the Amendment 80 Limited Access Fishery in the Eastern Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XS90) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5325. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Extension of Emergency Fishery Closure Due to the Presence of the Toxin that Causes Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning [Docket No.: 050613158-5262-03] (RIN: 0648-AT48) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5326. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2009 Management Measures for Petrale Sole [Docket No.: 0907301200-91380-02] (RIN: 0648-AY07) received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5327. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — List of Fisheries for 2010 [Docket No.: 090218194-91045-02] (RIN: 0648-AX65) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5328. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2008 annual report on the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5329. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Massachusetts Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5330. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-7, -7A, -7B, -9, -9A, -11, -15, and -17 Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0317; Directorate Identifier 79-ANE-18; Amendment 39-16087; AD 2009-24-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5331. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Clinch River, Mile Markers 0.5 to 1.5, Kingston, TN [COTP Ohio Valley-06-035] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5332. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, NH [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0895] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5333. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; SR 90 Bridge, Assawoman Bay, Isle of Wight and Ocean City, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0956] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5334. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone;

Sea World December Fireworks, Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0319] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5335. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC); Seal Island, ME [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0595] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5336. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; East Rockaway Inlet to Atlantic Beach Bridge, Nassau County, Long Island, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0085] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5337. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Areas; Bars Along the Coasts of Oregon and Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1017] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5338. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Blasting and Dredging Operations and Movement of Explosives, Columbia River, Portland to St. Helens, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0946] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5339. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Displays, Potomac River, National Harbor, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0949] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5340. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Corporate Party on Hornblower Yacht, Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0907] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5341. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Perdido Regional Host Outer Continental Shelf Platform, Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: USCG-2008-1051] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5342. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone and Regulated Navigation Area, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0942] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5343. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Miles 603.0 to 604.0, Louisville, KY [COTP Ohio Valley 06-037] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5344. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Ohio River, Miles 603.0 to 604.0, Louisville, KY [COTP Ohio Valley 06-038] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5345. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cincinnati, OH, Ohio River Mile 469.2 to 470.2 [COTP Ohio Valley 06-039] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5346. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Miles 449.0 to 451.0, New Richmond, OH [COTP Ohio Valley 06-046] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5347. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Miles 307.5 to 308.9, Huntington, WV [COTP Ohio Valley 06-047] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5348. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Ohio River Mile 462.0 to 471.0, Port of Cincinnati, OH [COTP Ohio Valley-06-048] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5349. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Mile Markers 256.3 to 260.0, Florence, AL [COTP Ohio Valley-06-049] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5350. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River Mile 332.8 to 333.8, Huntsville, AL [COTP Ohio Valley-06-050] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5351. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, Miles 467.0 to 475.0 and Licking River, Miles 0.0 to 0.5; Cincinnati, OH [COTP Ohio Valley 06-051] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5352. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 164 to Mile Marker 167, Above Head of Passes, Donaldsonville, VA [COTP New Orleans-06-038] (RIN 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5353. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 111.0 to Mile Marker 115.0, Above Head of Passes, Kenner, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-039] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5354. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 7.0, East of Harvey Lock (EHL) to Mile Marker 12.5, EHL, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-040] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5355. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 230 to Mile Marker 231, Port Allen, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-042] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5356. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 229.5 to Mile Marker 230.5, Baton Rouge, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-043] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5357. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; South Shore, Lake Pontchartrain, Metairie, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-045] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5358. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94 to Mile Marker 95, in the vicinity of Jackson Square, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-046] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5359. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Above Head of Passes, Mile Marker 175 to Mile Marker 176, Donaldsonville, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-047] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5360. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile Markers 51.5 to 52.5, Cape Girardeau, MO [COTP Ohio Valley-06-029] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5361. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cincinnati, OH, Ohio River Mile 461.0 to 470.0 [COTP Ohio Valley 06-033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5362. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; GICW MM295 to GICW MM377, Panama City, FL to East of the Fenholloway River, FL [COTP Mobile-06-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5363. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tombigee River, Demopolis, AL [COTP Mobile-06-020] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received Jan-

uary 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5364. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pensacola Bay, Pensacola, FL [COTP Mobile-06-021] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5365. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Orange Beach, AL [COTP Mobile-06-022] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5366. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Illinois Waterway, Illinois [CGD08-06-017] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5367. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bauernfind/Morris Wedding Fireworks, Betsie Lake, Frankfort, MI [CGD09-06-115] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5368. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Commonwealth Edison Power Line Crossing, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal mile marker 319.2 to 319.7, Chicago, IL [CGD09-07-019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5369. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; ACORA Garwood Classic Offshore Race, St. Clair River, North Channel, Algonac, MI [CGD09-07-020] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5370. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Veteran's Glass City Skyway Gala Fireworks, Maumee River, Toledo, OH [CGD09-07-026] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5371. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Roostertail Fireworks, Detroit River, Detroit, MI [CGD09-07-031] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5372. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Military Water Survival Training, Vicinity of Naval Amphibious Base Coronado, CA [COTP San Diego 07-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5373. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks, Lower Colorado River, Laughlin, NV [COTP San Diego 07-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5374. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay July 4th Fireworks Show [COTP San Diego 07-043] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5375. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mission Bay, CA [COTP San Diego 07-052] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5376. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Coronado Bridge, San Diego Bay, CA [COTP San Diego 07-074] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5377. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Marine Events in San Diego Harbor [COTP San Diego 07-069] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5378. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mission Bay San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 07-152] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5379. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 07-251] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5380. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mission Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 07-252] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5381. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; South San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 07-352] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5382. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kaiser Smokestack Demolition, Blair Waterway, Tacoma, Washington [CGD13-06-032] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5383. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Waters Adjacent 10th Avenue Marine Terminal, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 07-004] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5384. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ybor Fireworks Display — Ybor Turning Basin, Tampa Bay, Florida [COTP St. Petersburg 06-105] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received

January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5385. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; City of Ft. Myers Fireworks Display, Vicinity of Caloosahatchee River Bridge, Ft. Myers, Florida [COTP Sector St. Petersburg 06-124] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5386. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; July 4th Fireworks Display in the vicinity of Marco Island, Florida [COTP Sector St. Petersburg 06-137] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5387. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 4th of July Fireworks Display, Venice Inlet, Florida [COTP St. Petersburg 06-138] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5388. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display in the vicinity of Bradenton Beach, Florida [COTP Sector St. Petersburg 06-139] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5389. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Carlos Bay, FL [COTP Sector St. Petersburg 06-170] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5390. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations; Tampa Bay, FL [COTP Sector St. Petersburg 06-255] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5391. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Crazy Horse Campground, Lake Havasu, Arizona [COTP San Diego 05-030] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5392. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tampa Bay, FL [COTP St. Petersburg 06-081] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5393. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 05-053] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5394. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 05-061] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5395. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 05-080] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5396. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 05-091] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5397. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 05-093] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5398. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; North San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 05-097] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5399. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 05-100] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5400. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Diego Fall Classic, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 05-102] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5401. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Zones; Port Valdez, Valdez, AK [COTP Prince William Sound 07-001] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5402. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, to establish a public transportation safety program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5403. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2-1C, A300 B2-203, A300 B2K-3C, A300 B4-103, A300 B4-203, and A300 B4-2C Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0055; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-194-AD; Amendment 39-16125; AD 2009-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5404. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Worker Visibility [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2008-0157] (RIN: 2125-AF28) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5405. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Control Room Management/Human Factors [Docket ID: PHMSA-2007-27954; Amdt. Nos. 192-112 and

195-93] (RIN: 2137-AE28) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5406. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model S-92A Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1130; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-40-AD; Amendment 39-16130; AD 2009-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5407. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oversales and Denied Boarding Compensation [Docket No.: DOT-OST-01-9325] (RIN: 2105-AD63) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5408. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Transportation Workplace Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs [Docket No.: OST-2003-15245] (RIN: 2105-AD55) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5409. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Transportation Workplace Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs: Procedures for Non-Evidential Alcohol Screening Devices [Docket OST-2007-26828] (RIN: 2105-AD64) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5410. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0784; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-16124; AD 2009-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5411. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Transportation Workplace Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs: State Laws Requiring Drug and Alcohol Rule Violation Information [Docket OST-2008-0184] (RIN: OST-2105-AD67) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5412. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Model SAAB 2000 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0654; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-083-AD; Amendment 39-16058 AD 2009-22-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5413. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. LTS101 Series Turboshift and LTP101 Series Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1019; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-49-AD; Amendment 39-16104; AD 2009-24-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5414. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400, DHC-8-401, and DHC-8-402 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1106; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-171-AD; Amendment 39-16122; AD 2008-09-24 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5415. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the South Florida Low Offshore Airspace Area; Florida [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1167; Airspace Docket No. 08-ASO-16] received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5416. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the Atlantic Low Offshore Airspace Area; East Coast United States [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1170; Airspace Docket No. 08-AEA-27] received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5417. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mountain City, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0061; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-10] received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5418. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Fort A.P. Hill, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0739; Airspace Docket No. 09-AEA-14] received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5419. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Regulations Allowing for Polished Frost [Docket No.: FAA-2007-29281; Amendment Nos. 91-310, 125-58, 135-119] (RIN: 2120-AJ09) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5420. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Fuel Cell Cartridges and Systems Transported On Board Passenger Aircraft in Carry-On Baggage [Docket No.: PHMSA-2006-25446 (HM-243)] (RIN: 2137-AE19) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5421. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Jackson, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0937; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-27] received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5422. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Fort Stewart (Hinesville), GA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0959; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-30] received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5423. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200, -200LR, -300, and -300ER Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0571; Directorate identifier

2009-NM-004-AD; Amendment 39-16096; AD 2009-24-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5424. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-50C Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2006-24171; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-16093; AD 2007-11-18R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5425. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing 737-600, -700, -700C, and -800 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0411; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-190-AD; Amendment 39-16095; AD 2009-24-07] Received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5426. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-Trent 800 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0674; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-25-AD; Amendment 39-16092; AD 2009-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5427. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-111 and -112 Series Airplanes, and Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1037; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-174-AD; Amendment 39-16097; AD 2007-15-06 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5428. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Scheibe-Flugzeugbau GmbH Models Bergfalke-III, Bergfalke-II/55, SF 25C, and SF-26A Standard Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0800 Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-041-AD; Amendment 39-16088; AD 2009-24-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5429. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Inc. Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701 & 702), CL-600-2D15 (Regional Jet Series 705), and CL-600-2D24 (Regional Jet Series 900) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1075; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM181-AD; Amendment 39-16107; AD 2008-09-23- R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5430. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Adjustment of Monetary Threshold for Reporting Rail Equipment Accidents/Incidents for Calendar Year 2010 [FRA-2008-0136, Notice No.1] (RIN: 2130-ZA02) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5431. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Patents and Other Intellectual Property Rights (RIN: 2700-AD45) received December 1, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5432. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Surety Bond Guarantees; Size Standards (RIN: 3245-AF94) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

5433. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Loan Program for Systemically Important SBA Secondary Market Broker-Dealers (RIN: 3245-AF95) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

5434. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Inflationary Adjustments to Acquisition-Related Dollar Thresholds (RIN: 3245-AF74) received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

5435. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — HUBZone and Government Contracting (RIN: 3245-AF44) received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

5436. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a letter reporting the FY 2009 expenditures from the Pershing Hall Revolving Fund for projects, activities, and facilities that support the mission of the Department of Veterans Affairs, pursuant to Public Law 102-86, section 403(d)(6)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5437. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Port Limits of Columbus, Ohio [Docket No.: USCBP-2008-0047] received December 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5438. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's sixteenth annual report prepared in accordance with section 207 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (ATPA); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5439. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds; Customer Confirmation Reporting Requirement Threshold Amount [Docket No.: BPD GSRS 09-02] received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5440. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Rulings Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Calistoga Viticultural Area (2003R-496P) [Docket No.: TTB-2007-0067; T.D. TTB-83; Ref: Notice Nos. 36 and 77] (RIN: 1513-AA92) received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5441. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Report of tips by employee to employer (Rev. Proc. 2009-53) received December 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5442. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — New Qualified Plug-in Electric Drive Motor Vehicle Credit [Notice 2009-89] received December 4, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5443. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2009-56) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5444. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Permitted disparity in employer-provided contributions or benefits (Rev. Rul. 2009-40) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5445. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 807(e)(4) Exception for Section 338 Regulations [Notice 2010-1] received December 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5446. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Remedial Amendment Period and Reliance for Section 403(b) Plans [Announcement 2009-89] received December 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5447. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2009-96] received December 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5448. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Production Tax Credit for Refined Coal [Notice 2009-90] received December 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5449. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Industry Director's Directive #2 Super Completed Contract Method [LMSB Control No. LMSB-04-0209-006] received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5450. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Interactions with Foreign Tax Officials, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5451. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Adjustments of underpayments (Rev. Rul. 2009-39) received December 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5452. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2009-55) received December 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5453. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Field Directive on the Use of Estimates from Probability Samples [Control No. LMSB-4-0809-032] received November 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5454. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Updated for Weighted Average Interest Rate, Yield Curves, and Segment Rate [Notice 2009-88], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5455. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2009-54) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5456. A letter from the Deputy, Regulations and Security Standards, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — False Statements Regarding Security Background Checks [Docket No.: TSA-2008-0011] (RIN: 1652-AA65) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

5457. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Applications of Certain Appeals Provisions to the Medicare Prescription Drug Appeals Process [CMS-4127-F] (RIN: 0938-AO87) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

5458. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Changes to the Medicare Claims Appeal Procedures [CMS-4063-F] (RIN: 0938-AM73) received December 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

5459. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting Accounts containing unvouchered expenditures potentially subject to audit by the General Accounting Office, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3524(b); jointly to the Committees on the Budget, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2611. A Bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Securing the Cities Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3342. A Bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to develop water infrastructure in the Rio Grande Basin, and to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Pueblos of Nambe, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque; with an amendment (Rept. 111-390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1065. A bill to resolve water rights claims of the White Mountain Apache Tribe in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3644. A Bill to direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish education and watershed programs which advance environmental literacy, including preparedness and adaptability for the likely impacts of climate

change in coastal watershed regions; with an amendment (Rept. 111-392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3726. A bill to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3759. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant economy-related contract extensions of certain timber contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and timber purchasers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3254. A bill to approve the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

[Submitted January 5, 2010]

By Ms. SUTTON:

H. Res. 997. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding unfair and discriminatory practices of the government of Japan in its failure to apply its current and planned extension of the Government's Eco-friendly Vehicle Purchase and scrappage program to imported vehicles made by U.S. automakers; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

[Submitted January 12, 2010]

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 4413. A bill to provide grants and loan guarantees for the development and construction of science parks to promote the clustering of innovation through high technology activities; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Ms. WATSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HARE):

H.R. 4414. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a 75 percent tax on bonuses paid by certain financial and other businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4415. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to determine that certain individuals are unlawful enemy combatants subject to trial by military commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 4416. A bill to reauthorize the Great Ape Conservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4417. A bill to improve outreach and enrollment for the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4418. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to increase expenditures under pilot programs evaluating the effectiveness of risk management tools for livestock producers, to clarify that the education and information program includes livestock insurance programs and increase funds for the education and information program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4419. A bill to amend section 138 of the Truth in Lending Act to establish certain counseling and disclosure requirements with respect to reverse mortgages; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4420. A bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to misrepresentation through the use of a pass-through business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the waiver of required minimum distribution rules for certain retirement plans and accounts through 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4422. A bill to establish the Minority Entrepreneurship and Business Development Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4423. A bill to prevent Members of Congress from receiving any automatic pay adjustment in 2011; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4424. A bill to increase the energy credit for equipment used to generate electricity by geothermal power, to extend the grants for specified energy property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. BISHOP

of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. WEINER, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCMAHON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4425. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2-116th Street in North Troy, New York, as the "Martin G. 'Marty' Mahar Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 4426. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a 50 percent tax on bonuses paid by TARP recipients; to the

Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4427. A bill to provide a pay increase of 1.9 percent for members of the uniformed services for fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 998. A resolution providing for a committee to notify the President of the assembly of the Congress; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 999. A resolution to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House has assembled; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 1000. A resolution providing for the hour of meeting of the House; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H. Res. 1001. A resolution congratulating North Central College on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III men's cross country championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PLATTS (for himself, Ms. MATSUI,

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BACA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H. Res. 1002. A resolution honoring the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and encouraging the continued commitment to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day as a national day of service; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Ms. CORRINE

BROWN of Florida, Mr. WU, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CAO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BACA, and Mr. MASSA):

H. Res. 1003. A resolution expressing support for the designation of January 10, 2010, through January 16, 2010, as National Influenza Vaccination Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Res. 1004. A resolution congratulating the Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine for its 150 years of commitment to advancing science and improving health; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MASSA (for himself, Mr. DRIEHAUS,

Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. REYES, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. KISSELL):

H. Res. 1005. A resolution commemorating the 65th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge in World War II, honoring the sacrifices of members of the United States Armed Forces, and recognizing the Allied victory; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Res. 1006. A resolution reaffirming the commitment of the House of Representatives to safeguard and uphold the 10th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Submitted January 5, 2010]

H.R. 4123: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4325: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4400: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 4402: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4404: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 4405: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

[Submitted January 12, 2010]

H.R. 39: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 43: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 211: Mr. COSTA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 213: Mr. INGLIS.

H.R. 238: Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 333: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 389: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. NADLER of New York.

H.R. 391: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 426: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 433: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 450: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 482: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 503: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 537: Mr. PAUL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 571: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 847: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 868: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 874: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 930: Mr. OWENS and Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 954: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 997: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1030: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1034: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1079: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1101: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1204: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1221: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 1240: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1255: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1305: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1326: Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SCHAUER, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MINNICK, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.

H.R. 1347: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1402: Mr. CHILDERS and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1410: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1414: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1460: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1522: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1523: Mr. CAPUANO and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1526: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BARROW, Mr. PLATTS, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1547: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1552: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 1578: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1585: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1597: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1615: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 1646: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1691: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1766: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 1778: Ms. SUTTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HARE, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1806: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HARE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1826: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1844: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1924: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
H.R. 1956: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 2103: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2149: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2156: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2159: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2256: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. LEE of California, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2295: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 2296: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2324: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2408: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 2490: Mr. HODES.

H.R. 2512: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 2517: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2548: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2565: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2567: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 2578: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 2579: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2624: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 2672: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 2730: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 2866: Mr. VAN HOUTEN.

H.R. 2943: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 2958: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 2999: Mr. HEINRICH and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 3010: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3053: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3057: Mr. SESTAK, Ms. DeGETTE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3100: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3147: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 3149: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3185: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 3295: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3353: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 3355: Mr. NUNES, Mr. SIRES and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3480: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 3486: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3491: Mr. HALL of New York and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3545: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 3550: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3578: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3592: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3652: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 3674: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 3710: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3715: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3734: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3758: Ms. SUTTON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DENT, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 3764: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 3790: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 3939: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3943: Mr. TONKO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3994: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. CAO.

H.R. 4034: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 4036: Mr. FALCOMA and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4056: Mr. HODES.

H.R. 4065: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4072: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.

H.R. 4082: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 4107: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. INGLIS, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 4131: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 4141: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 4149: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 4180: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 4188: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4190: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4196: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4197: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4204: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4219: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 4235: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 4241: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 4255: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HODES, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. KRATOVIL.

H.R. 4290: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4295: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 4301: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 4325: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4373: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 4376: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 4383: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 4385: Mr. TANNER and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4393: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4400: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BACA, Mr. MASSA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 4402: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HARE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 4403: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. PENCE and Ms. GRANGER.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. MATHESON.

H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Con. Res. 170: Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Con. Res. 221: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 222: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H. Res. 22: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 111: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 231: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 267: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 569: Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 577: Mr. JORDAN of Ohio and Mr. COURTNEY.

H. Res. 605: Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 615: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Res. 699: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HARE, and Mr. KISSELL.

H. Res. 771: Mr. STUPAK.

H. Res. 847: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. LINDER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 848: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Res. 857: Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. SARBANES.

H. Res. 860: Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 862: Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 898: Mr. INGLIS and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H. Res. 911: Mr. HARPER.

H. Res. 925: Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 936: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 970: Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 975: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 977: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. WAMP, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. PLATTS.

H. Res. 981: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 989: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 990: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HARE.

H. Res. 997: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HARE, Ms. CORINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. McMAHON.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

92. The SPEAKER presented a petition of City of Lauderhill, FL, relative to Resolution No. 09R-09-223 thanking Congress for supporting the Federal Energy Block Grant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

93. Also, a petition of New Orleans City Council, New Orleans, Louisiana, relative to Resolution No. R-09-606 urging Congress to support the local oyster industry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

94. Also, a petition of American Bar Association, Chicago, IL, relative to Urging the Congress to help address the unmet legal needs of low income residents of communities affected by major disasters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.